



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO




3 1761 00589892 9





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

HANDBOOK FOR . . .
LITERARY AND . . .
DEBATING SOCIETIES



Handbook for Literary and Debating Societies

By Laurence M. Gibson, M.A.  

Including 83 Examples of Questions for Debate,
with Summarized Arguments on both sides.

TENTH EDITION

Entirely revised and greatly
Enlarged

169181.
9.2.22.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO



PREFACE TO THE TENTH EDITION

As some of the questions debated in the earlier editions have since been practically settled, and others are no longer of vital interest, a thorough revision of the whole book has been carried out, involving the deletion of more than a score of the old debates, the insertion of new ones in their place, the revision of the remaining subjects, and the compilation of an entirely new set of references for all the debates in the book. For the compilation of these references I am much indebted to the painstaking research of Miss Florence G. Fidler.

Of course, no attempt has been made to provide a complete bibliography on each subject for debate, nor have books been selected for their literary merit. The choice has fallen on those works which best provide the debater with compact information on the particular subject required, and preference has been given to those which are short, clear, and easily obtained. Pamphlets, although on many subjects of great value to the debater, are rarely quoted, because they are always ephemeral and rarely reprinted; on all subjects of a propaganda nature they can be easily obtained from the respective societies, the addresses of which can be found in Whitaker's Almanack. Such standard works as Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, the Encyclopædia Britannica, and the like, are not given as

of practical use to those who find themselves brought face to face with the stern necessity of taking part in a debate with scant time at their disposal for research.

If in any case the references given are found to be insufficient, the reader is referred to Poole's *Index to Periodicals* (with its supplements), Sonnenschein's *The Best Books*, the subject catalogues of any good library and the valuable Bibliographies dealing with special subjects (to find these refer to the excellent *Bibliography of Bibliographies* in the British Museum Reading Room).

LAURENCE M. GIBSON.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
BRIEF DIRECTIONS FOR THE CONDUCT OF A PUBLIC MEETING	13
EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONS FOR DEBATE	
OUGHT WE TO ENDOW RESEARCH?	27
HAVE ANIMALS INTELLIGENCE?	31
ARE STRIKES JUSTIFIABLE?	35
OUGHT ARBITRATION IN TRADE DISPUTES TO BE ENFORCED BY LAW?	37
IS BRITISH ART DECLINING?	40
ZIONISM	44
BOLSHEVISM	48
SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR IRELAND	52
SHOULD CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BE ABOLISHED?	57
DO CHARITY ORGANIZATIONS DO GOOD OR HARM?	61
ARE THE CHURCHES ON THE DOWN GRADE?	64
OUGHT THE CHURCH TO ADVOCATE SOCIAL REFORM?	68
IS THE CHURCH TO BLAME FOR THE ALIENATION OF WORKING MEN?	71
IS MODERN CIVILIZATION A FAILURE?	74

	PAGE
✓ OUGHT WE TO CONTINUE SOME FORM OF CONSCRIPTION IN GREAT BRITAIN ?	77
Is CONSISTENCY A VICE OR A VIRTUE ?	81
ARE CONVENTUAL AND MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS WORTH PRESERVING ?	83
✓ SHOULD DIVORCE BE MADE EASIER ?	86
SHALL WE DISESTABLISH AND DISENDOW THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ?	90
✓ DOES MODERN DRESS NEED REFORM ?	95
✓ SHOULD THE DRINK TRAFFIC BE NATIONALIZED ?	98
TAXATION OF LAND VALUES AND THE SINGLE TAX	101
SHOULD PARLIAMENT LIMIT THE HOURS OF THE WORKING DAY ?	104
✓ DOES THE MODERN STATE NEED A FIGURE-HEAD ?	109
✓ OUGHT COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS TO BE ABOLISHED ?	112
SHOULD THE HOUSE OF LORDS BE REFORMED ?	114
✓ OUGHT OUR EMPIRE TO FEDERATE ?	118
ARE THE LANDED GENTRY WORTH PRESERVING ?	123
✓ ARE PHANTASMS OF THE DEAD REAL OR IMAGINARY ?	126
PARTY GOVERNMENT—Is IT A USEFUL OR A MISCHIEVOUS SYSTEM ?	131
✓ OUGHT WE TO SUBMIT TO THE TYRANNY OF CONVENTION ?	133
✓ REINCARNATION	136
SHOULD HOSPITALS BE MAINTAINED AND MANAGED BY THE STATE ?	140
✓ OUGHT WE TO GRANT SELF-GOVERNMENT TO INDIA ?	142

CONTENTS

9

/PAGE


IS THE DIVISION OF LABOUR NOW CARRIED TO HURTFUL EXCESS?	146
SMALL HOLDINGS	148
SHOULD PARLIAMENT RESTRAIN EXCESSIVE LUXURY?	151
HAS THE INTRODUCTION OF MACHINERY DONE MORE HARM THAN GOOD?	154
ARE MODERN CHRISTIAN MISSIONS A FAILURE?	157
ARE PRIVATE MONOPOLIES PUBLIC EVILS?	161
MUNICIPAL GAS SUPPLY	164
MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS	166
DOUGHT WE TO ADOPT A SYSTEM OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM?	168
SHOULD THE POOR LAW BE RECONSTRUCTED?	172
SHOULD ALL PATENTS BE ABOLISHED?	175
HAS SURVIVAL AFTER DEATH BEEN PROVED BY MODERN SPIRITUALISM?	177
SHOULD OUR PRISONS BE TURNED INTO REFORMATORIES?	183
IS PROFIT-SHARING THE CURE FOR LABOUR TROUBLES?	186
ARE BETTING AND GAMBLING NATIONAL EVILS?	189
SHOULD WE ADOPT PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION?	193
IS THE PULPIT LOSING ITS POWER?	198
SHOULD ESPERANTO BE ADOPTED AS THE INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE?	202
SHOULD THE REFERENDUM BE INTRODUCED INTO ENGLISH POLITICS?	206
CAN A MAN GET RICH HONESTLY?	209
THE LESS THE STATE MEDDLES WITH THE INDIVIDUAL THE BETTER.	212

	PAGE
✓ IS CHRISTIANITY MADE INEFFECTIVE BY THE DIVISIONS AMONG THE CHURCHES?	215
✓ SOCIALISM	217
ARE WE TOO FOND OF SPORT AND GAMES?	224
RAILWAY NATIONALIZATION	227
SHOULD MINES, CANALS AND THE LIKE BE NATIONALIZED? .	230
X IS SUICIDE EVER JUSTIFIABLE?	232
SHOULD WE HAVE THE CONTINENTAL SUNDAY?	236
ARE THE RESULTS OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS SATISFACTORY? .	240
IS THE INVESTIGATION OF PSYCHIC PHENOMENA DANGEROUS? .	243
SHOULD THEOLOGICAL DIFFICULTIES BE FREELY DISCUSSED? .	247
ARE TRADE UNIONS ON THE WHOLE MISCHIEVOUS OR BENE- FICIAL?	250
SHOULD WE ABOLISH TRIAL BY JURY?	253
SHOULD VACCINATION BE ENFORCED BY LAW?	256
SHOULD WE PROHIBIT VIVISECTION?	261
SHOULD CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS BE TOLERATED IN TIME OF WAR?	264
SHOULD THE WORK OF THE CLERGY BE PUT UPON A VOLUNTARY BASIS?	270
✓ SHOULD THE " UNFIT " BE RESTRAINED FROM PARENTHOOD? .	275
SYNDICALISM.	279
IS THE CINEMA A DEGENERATING AMUSEMENT?	282
IS THE WORLD GROWING BETTER?	285
LOCAL VETO	291
EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK	295

CONTENTS

II

	PAGE
CLASSICAL VERSUS MODERN EDUCATION.	298
SHALL WE GO BACK TO PROTECTION?	302
COMMERCIAL RETALIATION	309
COLONIAL PREFERENCE	314
SHOULD A LIVING WAGE FOR ALL BE FIXED BY PARLIAMENT?	320
IS A SYSTEM OF MENTAL TRAINING WORTH WHILE?	323



BRIEF DIRECTIONS FOR THE CONDUCT OF A PUBLIC MEETING

AT a Literary and Debating Society's meetings it is no uncommon thing to find that the chairman has but a vague notion of his duties and of his powers, and the natural result is that sometimes the meeting falls into a confusion which could easily have been prevented if the chairman had only known how to act. It may not seem, then, out of place if the main duties of a chairman are briefly set forth and his powers explained.

CHOICE OF A CHAIRMAN

The success of any public meeting depends so much upon the skill and discretion of the chairman that special care should always be taken to obtain a suitable person for the office. Very frequently the rules of the Society provide for the filling of this office, and in this case there is no difficulty. If, however, a chairman is not appointed by the rules, or if the appointed chairman be absent, then another must be elected when the meeting comes together.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The following is generally established by custom as being the best order in which to transact the business of the meeting :—

14. HANDBOOK FOR LITERARY SOCIETIES

1. A good way to begin is to announce the object for which the meeting has come together. Special care should be taken to do this, if there is any danger of the object having been only indefinitely grasped by those attending. If the purposes for which the meeting has come together be well understood, this explanation is not necessary. Sometimes the method of opening the meeting is provided for by the rules, and then, of course, it is the chairman's first duty so to open the meeting, or to call upon some one else to do so.

2. His next duty is to call upon the secretary to read the minutes of the last meeting, and, after the reading, the chairman should ask the meeting if these minutes are approved as correct. It is here in order for any one to rise and criticise the minutes as inaccurate or defective, and if the criticism is held to be just by the meeting, the secretary must alter the minutes accordingly; but if, on the other hand, the meeting approve the minutes, then, after they are signed by the chairman, the business proceeds, the chairman calling for the

3. Reports of the standing committees (if any). Every Literary and Debating Society will almost certainly have at least one standing committee, whose members are appointed at the Annual Meeting, and who transact the business of the Society. As this committee has considerable trust reposed in it, there should be a report of its proceedings laid before the Society from time to time (as the business may require) for the information and the satisfaction of the members of the Society. The powers of this committee are often defined in the rules.

4. Reports of special committees (if any). The distinction between a "standing" and a "special" committee should be carefully observed. A "standing" committee is appointed by the Society for the quick despatch of its

ordinary business, and its powers are usually defined in the rules ; but often special questions arise involving inquiries, or the drawing up of documents or the like, and it is very convenient in these cases to appoint a " special " committee for the particular business. These special committees always receive " instructions " at the time of their appointment ; that is, they are given to understand exactly what is required of them, and when they have discharged the duty thus laid upon them, they report to the Society, and are dismissed from the duty, or have the matter referred back to them for reconsideration, in which case, of course, they must report again before they can be dismissed.

5. Orders of the day (if any). Sometimes it is appointed by the Society that a certain matter shall be discussed upon a certain day, and when, therefore, the day appointed comes, this matter must be given precedence ; or else, if it is left till later in the evening, it runs the risk of being shelved for lack of time, and then the chairman puts himself in the unfortunate position of having, by bad management, really defeated what he had previously appointed to be considered. If for any reason the orders of the day are not discussed, then they fall to the ground, and they must be renewed if they are to be discussed at the next meeting.

6. Business unfinished. If any notices of motions have been given at the previous meeting, the motions are discussed under this head.

7. New business, such as election of new members, notices of motions, etc. The chairman, having thus cleared the ground, can now proceed to the

8. Main object of the meeting. This may be (a) to hear an essay, (b) to hold a debate, or (c) to listen to a lecture. The chairman will of course modify his action according to the form of the matter in hand. (a) If an

essay is to be read, the chairman should state in a few words the subject of the essay, and call upon the essayist to read it. (b) If there is to be a debate, the chairman announces the subject, reminds the audience of the rules as to time, drawing attention to any special regulation which may have been made by the committee, and then calls upon the opener to lead off the debate. It is very advisable that any special regulation should be laid before the meeting in order that the chairman may get authority to enforce it. (c) If it is a lecture, the chairman may introduce the lecturer in a few words to the audience and bespeak an attentive hearing.

9. (a) When the essay is over, the chairman may throw open the meeting to those who wish to make any remarks on the subject of the essay, or (with the permission of the essayist), he may invite any questions, which often give rise to much interest, especially if the essayist be an expert in the subject of which he is treating. Then the essayist is given an opportunity for reply, and the meeting is closed by a few words from the chair, summing up the proceedings.

(b) When the debate is over, it is usual for the chairman briefly to sum up the debate, being very careful to be impartial. This requires a clear and a cool head, and unless the chairman feels capable, it is better not attempted, except in general terms. Then he should call upon the supporter of the negative to reply (it being presumed that the supporter of the positive led off the debate), and afterwards he should call upon the supporter of the positive to reply. After this, the chairman clearly announces the question in debate, so as to leave as little room for doubt as possible as to the exact nature of the issue. Then the votes are taken, first for the negative, then for the positive, either by show of hands, or by division, or by ballot. In any case, there must be more than one teller, or counter, of votes. When

the tellers are agreed, they inform the chairman of the result, and he announces it to the meeting, and, with a few words, brings the proceedings to a close.

(c) When the lecture is over, the chairman may make a few remarks, and give an opportunity for some one to propose a vote of thanks, which, on being seconded and passed he presents (as it were) to the lecturer, who replies briefly, and the chairman closes the meeting. When a vote of thanks is proposed to the chairman, it is customary for the seconder to put it to the meeting.

Meetings are held for many other purposes than those mentioned, but it is usually easy enough for the chairman to see how he should modify his methods to suit the peculiarities of each case.

There are one or two matters of detail which it would be as well to draw out somewhat at length.

METHOD OF DEALING WITH GENERAL MOTIONS, [AMENDMENTS, ETC.]

Here is where chairmen most frequently fall into confusion, through not being sufficiently careful to observe the useful rule that there should not be more than one motion before the meeting at a time. Suppose a meeting has been called for which there is no definite agenda paper, through the items of which the chairman can methodically move, but which has met to deliberate or consult. The chairman will begin by calling for some motion to be laid before the meeting. This motion should be handed to the chairman in writing, and he should distinctly announce the name of the speaker to it. We can call this, for the sake of convenience, "Motion A." When the proposer of this motion sits down, the chairman asks for a seconder, and if any one should rise at this stage to criticize the motion, or to propose another, or to propose a direct negative, or to

do anything but second the motion, he is out of order, and must be at once ruled so by the chair. The "Motion A" cannot be laid before the meeting until seconded, and, if it is not seconded, it falls to the ground.

We have now reached the stage when "Motion A," duly seconded, is laid by the chairman before the meeting, and now the following courses of procedure are in order :—

1. The Previous Question may be proposed, and does not require to be seconded. It is best moved in this form :—
 "That the main question be now put." If this receives a negative answer, the subject under discussion is often regarded as disposed of for the day, and if in the affirmative, the main question must be put at once without further discussion. The Previous Question is such an obscure phrase, and there is so much confusion in the public mind as to what it exactly means, that it is well to avoid the expression. It is better to propose exactly what is wanted in plain words, viz., "That we do not take a vote to-day," "That we now proceed to the next business," or the like ; that is, whenever possible, resort to the well-understood closure and keep clear of the moribund phrase "Previous Question."

2. A direct negative may be proposed, and, if seconded, stands. The meaning of a direct negative is plain, and raises at once a clear issue.

3. An amendment to the motion may be proposed, and, if seconded, stands. A proposer of an amendment may agree in general with the motion, but object on a matter of detail which he wishes altered, and the chairman should note down the exact nature of the alteration proposed. An amendment sometimes attacks a vital clause in the motion, which, if altered, would make the motion ridiculous, and so secure its defeat.

4. The best way of dealing with amendments is as follows :

Insist on the amendments being proposed in the order of the clauses of the motion, and put each amendment to the vote against that part of the motion to which it applies before passing on to the next amendment. This is the practice of Parliament, and has many advantages. If an amendment is carried against the motion, then the "Motion as Amended" must be put to the meeting as a "Substantive Motion," and a fresh debate may take place.

The following points should also be borne in mind :—

1. No one can alter or withdraw an amendment or a motion without the consent of his seconder and of the meeting.

2. Care should be taken to see that amendments as they arise are exclusive of one another, *i.e.* if an amendment is proposed and seconded, and afterwards another dealing with the same substantial matter is advanced, it should either be put as an amendment to the amendment or ruled out of order.

3. If any one rises to a point of order, he should be heard at any stage, and the same rule applies to any one rising to a point of privilege, *i.e.* a matter dealing with the rights of any one as a man or as a member of the Society. If the chairman considers the interrupting speaker to have made his point good, he puts the issue before the meeting, who decide; but if he considers that it is not made good he rules it out of order, and goes on. This applies also to any motion to suspend a rule.¹

4. It should be noted that a "motion" is the matter

¹ This should be done by general consent, but usually the rules of the Society deal with the matter. It may be added that a member has a right to explain himself, but not to interrupt another for this purpose: he should wait until the speech is over, and then offer his explanation, being careful not to trench upon the question at issue, especially if he has already spoken upon it.

in hand stated, that when the matter in hand is laid before the meeting it becomes the "question," and when it is passed it becomes either (a) an order of the assembly,

or (b) a resolution of the assembly,

or (c) a vote of the assembly.

5. Before business can be transacted a "quorum" must be present. The number constituting a quorum is usually fixed by the rules, and if not it should be a majority of the members.

6. The chairman should always rise to state a motion or to put a question.

7. The following are the recognized means at the disposal of the chairman for restraining unruly individuals :—(a) Reprimand. A little tact and humour go a long way towards preventing disorder. If those present feel that the chairman is doing his best to act justly they are sure to support him. The chairman should bear in mind that he is acting in an official and not in a private capacity, and that therefore his tone should always be calm and judicial. Unless he can keep his personal feelings under strict control, he is not fit to be chairman. (b) Exclusion from the meeting. It should be noted that no remarks are allowed except those addressed to the chairman, and anything like a personal altercation must be stopped. This can be done by insisting on one of the contending parties addressing the chair and making a definite motion, which, if seconded, can be put to the vote. If two speakers insist on being heard, and neither will withdraw, the chairman should get the meeting to vote on which they will hear. In the event of a speaker taking excessive time, the chairman should take a vote to discover whether those present are willing to hear the speaker further. (c) A prohibition to speak or vote for a specified time. (d) Expulsion from the Society. In

the extreme case of a person insisting upon attending the meetings of a society from which he has been expelled, with the express object of making a disturbance, the society should, if they own the premises where the meetings are held, take means to prevent that person entering the meeting ; otherwise a constable should be called in to maintain order.¹ (e) Apology on pain of expulsion is also sometimes resorted to.

8. Any motion for the enforcement of the rules, or any motion dealing with a matter of order, or proposing the previous question, or for the consideration of the orders of the day, does not need to be seconded (because it manifestly deals with matters already decided or taken for granted by the meeting).

9. When a motion is made, it can be met in one of the following ways :—

(a) By Previous Question (which puts the matter to the vote at once).

(b) By postponing *sine die*—this shelves the motion.

(c) By postponing to some future day (mentioned).

(d) By proposing that “it lie on the table,” *i.e.* for future consideration.

(e) By referring it to a committee.

(f) By proposing an amendment.

(g) By proposing a direct negative.

A debate can be stopped in the following ways :—

(a) By passing a motion that the chairman do now leave the chair. This, if carried, brings the meeting to an end.

(b) By a motion “that we pass to the next business.” This stops the debate without closing the meeting.

(c) By the closure. The chairman allows a motion

¹ As a last resort the chairman can send for the police and have the room cleared.

to be interpolated "that we now vote," or "that we vote at a certain time." This motion is open to amendments concerning time, but to no others.

10. If a motion embraces two or more matters, it is often convenient to break it up into separate questions, which are put before the meeting, in succession, by the chairman. A motion is of course necessary before this can be done.

11. When a motion deals with sums of money and periods of time, these matters are sometimes left blank in the motion and new motions must be made, taking precedence of the original one, to fill up these blanks. In putting these details before the meeting the rule in England is that the smallest sum proposed and the longest time proposed be put first.

12. Every member present has the right to speak once to a resolution, and it is the duty of the chairman to see that the remarks made are confined to the subject in hand. It is well that the adjournment of a debate be moved by one who has not spoken, and the general understanding is that it is the duty of the mover of the adjournment to open the discussion at the adjourned meeting. Those who have spoken on a subject cannot be heard again on the same subject at an adjourned meeting. The seconder of a motion may reserve his speech while seconding the motion by a gesture. A seconder of an amendment, of course, cannot thus reserve his speech. No second speech upon the same question is allowed. Under this rule any one who has once spoken to a motion cannot speak again to the motion or move an amendment; but when an amendment is moved, a new question is before the meeting, and consequently those who have spoken to the original motion may speak again. The mover of a motion or an amendment has no right of reply, but by courtesy a reply is often allowed to the mover of a motion.

13. It should be noted that if the chairman intends to vote in his private capacity, he should distinctly say so before it becomes clear which way the question is likely to be settled. If the votes are equal, then the chairman has a casting vote, even though he may have voted previously. These two votes of the chairman arise from the fact that he is acting in two capacities, private and official.

GOING INTO COMMITTEE

To consider any urgent business, the whole meeting can go into committee on a motion to that effect being proposed and passed. In this case the chairman leaves the chair and another is appointed. The following points in the procedure of a committee of the whole Society should be noticed :—

1. The Previous Question cannot be moved, but it may be moved that the committee rise.
2. The committee does not adjourn, but must rise, and before it can sit again, it must obtain permission to do so.
3. Any member may speak as often as he can get the floor.
4. A committee of the whole cannot appoint a sub-committee.
5. A committee of the whole has no authority in questions of breaches of order, but must refer them to the assembly.

When the committee of the whole rises, then the temporary chairman of committee vacates the chair, which is taken by the chairman of the assembly or society. Then the chairman of committee reports the business done in committee to the chair, and it is either ratified as it stands, or resolutions or orders are made upon it, or votes are taken upon it, or the matter is referred back.


THE BOOK OF MINUTES

This is kept by the secretary of the Society, and technically need contain only "things done and passed" by the assembly, but it is usually expected in societies that it should also be something of a journal. The following suggestions, then, of what the minute book of a Literary and Debating Society should contain may be found useful :—

1. All resolutions as put from the chair.
2. Every question proposed or put from the chair, whether carried or not.
3. Number of votes given on each division.
4. Names of those who spoke.
5. Chairman's decisions on matters of order.
6. When a postponed or adjourned proceeding is to be considered,—which will become an order of the day.
7. All notices of motions,—which will become the unfinished business of a following meeting.
8. All documents.
9. A careful index should be kept, or else the book will be useless for reference. Such headings as the following may appear with advantage in the index :—
 - Syllabuses—pages where stuck in.
 - Decisions or orders by chair—pages where they appear.
 - Motions affecting the constitution of the Society, with pages where they appear and the number of the rules they modify.
 - Annual reports, including membership, average attendances, officers, etc.
 - Annual balance sheets.
 - Committee meetings, etc., etc.
 - Documents.

REFERENCES :—

- The Chairman's Handbook*, by Sir Reginald Palgrave (Sampson Low, 1900).
The Chairman's and Debater's Handbook, by D. M. Ransom (Routledge's Pocket Library, 1913).
The Conduct of Public Meetings, by J. Hunt Cooke (Alexander & Shephard, 1895).
Public Speaking and Chairmanship, by G. E. O'Dell (Clerk Publishing Company, 1911).



EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONS FOR DEBATE

OUGHT WE TO ENDOW RESEARCH ?

YES

1. At present all the resources of our universities are used with a view to the teaching of existing knowledge, and there is neither time, energy nor funds left for the making of new knowledge. The public are willing to admit the claims of technical education, but they do not understand the importance of pure science. "The worker in pure science discovers; his fellow in applied science utilizes." The talent for original research is rare and at present any one possessing it is usually rewarded by being appointed to a teaching post. This system is all wrong. The claims of pure scientific inquiry should be acknowledged and funds should be provided by the State to permit those qualified to follow out their researches free from material anxieties. This work is never in the first instance remunerative, but as it is carried on for the public good, it should be maintained at the public expense.

2. Scholarships for research are useless, because they are not sufficient to enable any particular investigation to be carried through. There must be professional posts tenable for life and with salaries likely to tempt the best men. There should also be special institutions for this purpose presided over by capable men. "There is no influence,

no training, no development so important and so entirely without possible substitute, as that arising from the association of younger men in research and investigation with an older, gifted and authoritative investigator who makes them co-workers with him in some great line of inquiry." Charitable doles to poor students are no substitute for this.

3. Before the war the gross revenue of the agricultural research stations in Germany approached £400,000: the parallel figure for France was £60,000 and for England, £40,000! The American total was £1,000,000. This is the way we lag behind for want of a reasonable endowment of research. It is for want of this research that our business men have been content to cling to antiquated methods which ought to have been superseded long ago. They let their dyes be manufactured abroad in a way they never even attempted to understand, and then these methods were taught to their dyers without any effort to teach them the reason why. The result of all this has been industrial dependence. It is high time for us to be up and doing our own research: any money spent on it is the best possible national investment.

4. The Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction was appointed in 1870. Its Report was issued in ten parts from 1871-1895 and the nation has suffered incalculable loss by not giving heed to its recommendations. We want all our different research bodies co-ordinated. There must be a great clearing house for scientific facts and a central authority to prevent overlapping, as well as to give guidance as to the most necessary lines of inquiry. Our youth must not only be taught the facts of science, but its methods, and this can only be done by giving scope for research. There is the research which the individual firm finds it profitable to finance, then there is the research which a group of firms or an industry may finance, but lastly

there is the research which the State alone is in a position to finance. It is for this last kind that we demand proper endowment.

— OUGHT WE TO ENDOW RESEARCH ?

NO

1. The more science is left to itself the better. The moment the State interferes with science, there is much more likely to be obstruction than progress.

2. The Endowment of Research would mean the setting up of a Government Department with a host of officials, who would be appointed not on account of their scientific attainments or suitability for their posts, but on account of services rendered to one or other of the political parties. There would be plentiful research among their own documents, files, memoranda and card indexes, there would certainly be an enormous waste of public money, but there would be very little actual Scientific Research accomplished.

3. Research has led Germany to a useless elaboration of details. The collection of "data" became a craze. It is claimed on the other hand for France that she has made a greater number of discoveries of the first rank. We see from this how difficult it is to "organize" research in the Prussian manner. Science must be quite free from control or it will not flourish.

4. If the state were to endow research it would want naturally some control over the expenditure of the money. Functionaries would be appointed and these would surely begin to impose methods and preconceived ideas on the investigators. This would stifle initiative, so much so that we might even reach the stage at which really valuable discoveries would be officially suppressed, because they were not on prescribed lines. The state may be able to manage a Post Office, but it certainly could not organize research.

REFERENCES:—

- Report of the Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction of 1870* (an article on this Report appeared in *Nature*, March 26, 1874).
- Science and the Nation*: a symposium by Cambridge graduates (Cambridge University Press, 1917).
- Modern Surgery and its Making*: chap. i., by C. W. Saleeby (Simpkin Marshall, 1911).
- The Whole Armour of Man*, by C. W. Saleeby (Grant Richards, 1919).
- Socialism and the Great State*, a symposium: chap. iv. "The Making of New Knowledge," by Sir E. Ray Lankester (Harper, 1912).
- The Romance of Medicine*, by Ronald C. McFie (Cassell, 1907).
- Articles on State Endowment of Research appeared in *Nature*, Sept. 6, Oct. 18, Nov. 8, and Dec. 6, 1917; and Feb. 28, 1918. "A Plea for Scientific Research," by Charles Ross (*Science Progress*, April, 1919).
- The Scientific Monthly* published articles on the subject in July, Sept., Nov. and Dec., 1916; Feb., March and June, 1917.

HAVE ANIMALS INTELLIGENCE ?

YES

1. The statement is often made that animals act only upon impulse. This statement is pure assumption, and if the facts are examined, there are found to be many indications of distinct intelligence in animals, *e.g.*,—

(a) Animals have undoubtedly different natures or characters : some are revengeful, some stupid, some clever, some friendly, some savage, some affected and hypocritical, some honest and straightforward, some brave, some cowardly. In all these varying characteristics their likeness to man appears, and the presence of positive thinking faculties is indicated.

(b) Animals are undoubtedly subject to vices. When they have the temptation put before them they become intemperate, and their sexual instinct becomes perverted or abnormally developed just as in man. In all this intelligence plainly appears.

(c) The oddities and eccentricities of animals are as remarkable as those of men, and indicate the same curious idiosyncrasy of mind.

2. There are numerous examples (such as those given by G. J. Romanes) of animals acting from conscientious motives apart from the fear of punishment, and these show the rudiments of a moral consciousness which can only

arise from an intelligent appreciation of some of the different values of conduct.

3. The experiments carried on by J. Henri Fabre with insects demonstrate the presence in these insects of something so like intelligence as to make it difficult to find any other appropriate word to use.

4. There are different degrees of intelligence in animals, compare for instance an elephant with a sheep, or a dog with a hen. These striking contrasts cannot be denied without ignoring plain facts, and if they are admitted the question is settled.

5. The interesting experiments carried out by Wilhelm v. Osten and Karl Krall with the famous reckoning horses "Zarif," "Muhammed" and "Hans" are conclusive on this question. These horses were trained not only to recognize letters of the alphabet and to count, but even to make mathematical calculations of some complexity, such as extracting square roots.

NO

1. No one can be blind to the fact that there is a radical difference between the mental constitution of animals and that of man. We express this difference by saying that animals act from instinct, while man acts from intelligence. We cannot explain what instinct is, but we know that it differs from intelligence fundamentally. The failure to make this distinction between mere instinct and positive intelligence leads to many fanciful errors:—

- (a) The idea that animals have different characters is an indication of how we fancifully imagine we see our own characteristics in animals because their conduct sometimes seems to indicate that they suffer pleasure, pain, and animal passion.
- (b) Animals are only subject to vices when their natural

and healthy instincts are perverted by man. When left to themselves, they simply obey their instincts.

(c) The so-called eccentricities of animals are accounted for by the unrestrained imagination of animal-lovers dealing with certain peculiarities of instinct.

2. It is notorious that very few animal stories can bear much investigation. To speak of conscience in animals is to revive the exploded superstition that animals have souls.

3. What is called intelligence in animals is merely the reaction of the animal to the stimulus of its subconscious mind. Intelligence in human beings is an activity of a self-conscious mind—manifestly quite a different thing. The results of these different processes may sometimes appear to be the same, but only to a superficial observer. Both a dog and a man may be able to swim: with the dog this is an immediate reaction to his subconscious mind, while with the man swimming must be learned by a considerable effort of self-conscious intelligence.

4. It is not in individual "intelligence" that animals differ, but in racial, that is to say all elephants differ in much the same way from all sheep in this respect. The difference among men, however, is an individual matter. It would seem that animals react to the promptings of a race or group-spirit which we term "instinct" and which differs widely in the various species. However this may be explained it is clearly not the same thing as the pre-eminently individual intelligence with which men are endowed.

5. Although the experiments with the thinking horses of Elberfeld seem to be quite genuine, nevertheless the possibility of acoustic or even of tactual signs being given to the animals is not shut out. The number and the nature of the errors made by these horses should be studied closely,

for they seem sufficient to refute the conclusions drawn.

REFERENCES :—

The Senses of Animals, by Sir J. Lubbock (International Scientific Series).

Animal Intelligence, by G. J. Romanes (Kegan Paul).

The Wonders of Instinct, by J. H. Fabre (Fisher Unwin, 1917).

All M. Fabre's books are valuable.

What is Instinct? by C. Bingham Newland (John Murray, 1916).

The Investigation of Mind in Animals, by E. M. Smith (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1915), contains a useful bibliography.

The Life of the Bee, by Maurice Maeterlinck (George Allen & Sons, 1901).

Articles on "Thinking Animals" (*Nature*, Dec. 17, 1914); on "The Storing Instinct," by J. A. Thompson (*New Statesman*, Jan. 15, 1916); and on "Do Animals make Mistakes?" by F. G. Afalo (*Chambers Journal*, July, 1916).

The two *Jungle Books*, by Rudyard Kipling, and the various stories of animals by Ernest Thompson Seton and Jack London are illustrative.

ARE STRIKES JUSTIFIABLE ?

YES

1. Morally they are justifiable, because they benefit more than they injure the majority of mankind.

2. Capital is organized with the object of allowing the minimum possible to labour of the fruits of industry. The only available weapon to the worker is the strike.

3. Arbitration cannot be considered the universal cure for labour troubles. The arbitrator is necessarily chosen from the upper classes, whose interests are always, directly or indirectly, with capital. It is only the fear of strikes that makes arbitration possible.

4. Too much attention is paid to the direct expense which strikes cause, and even to the privation which they entail upon the unemployed. These evils obtrude themselves upon the notice of every one, but they are not great relatively to the issues at stake. The policy of a campaign is not to be judged by the gain or loss of a particular battle. Even defeat is no proof that the strike was a mistake.

5. Every man has the right to withhold his labour if he please. If this is so individually, why not collectively ?

NO

1. They entail suffering upon a far greater number than benefit by them.

2. The interests of capital and labour are in the end

identical, and except when stirred up by strikes, there is no hostility to labour on the part of capital.

3. They are unnecessary. Arbitration can be made use of as effectively. It is untrue that arbitration tells unfairly in favour of employers. On the contrary, it tells in favour of labour, since the employer agrees to leave to the decision of the uninitiated technical points with which he alone can really deal. Moreover, there is a natural tendency on the part of an outsider to be biased in favour of the worker, who is regarded as the weaker of two opponents.

4. Even if successful their cost is too great, and the gain in wages is balanced by the loss in unemployment. Taking the last fifteen years it will be found that wages have advanced most in trades where conciliation has been most adopted.

5. They make for corruption in trade union officials, and encourage the paid agitator.

REFERENCES :—

Strikes : When to Strike and how to Strike. By O. T. Crosby. 1910.

Direct Action v. Legislation. By J. B. Smith. 1907.

The Living Wage. By Philip Snowden, M.P. 1912.

Economics of Industry. By Prof. Marshall.

Burnett's Reports on Cost of Strikes to Board of Trade.

Syndicalism and the General Strike, by Arthur D. Lewis. (Fisher Unwin, 1912).

Strikes and Social Problems, by J. S. Nicholson (Black, 1896).

The World of Labour (chap. vi.), by G. D. H. Cole (Bell, 1913).

Democracy at the Crossways, by F. J. C. Hernshaw (Macmillan, 1918).

Two Plays—*Strife*, by John Galsworthy; and *Sealing the Compact* by Gwen John (Duckworth).

Article, "The Working Man in War Time," by Harrison Smith (*Century Magazine*, March, 1916).

The References quoted for Debates on "Socialism and Syndicalism," apply here.

OUGHT ARBITRATION IN TRADE DISPUTES TO BE ENFORCED BY LAW ?

YES

1. Private arbitration has not proved successful, as the history of the long series of disastrous strikes sufficiently shows.

2. Industrial strife is apt to reach dangerous dimensions, threatening the public good if not the public peace, and hence the Government has a perfect right to interfere in the matter and make arbitration compulsory. It may be said on the one hand that a man's business is his own, and on the other that workmen have a right to combine ; but the prosperity of the nation cannot be allowed to become endangered from the selfishness of either or of both parties.

3. It may be urged that a man cannot be forced to open his works or men be compelled to work, and though this is true, yet both parties can be indirectly forced by fines. It has been urged against the Truck Acts, Shop Hours Acts, Employers' Liability Acts and the like, that they were infringements of the liberty of the subject, and yet they are obeyed, and the case would be the same with compulsory arbitration.

4. The findings of arbitration courts would create no more trouble than the findings of our courts of law, and as the one is submitted to because in the main its decisions are felt to be just, so would the proposed arbitration courts be obeyed.

5. A scheme of compulsory arbitration could readily be fenced with safeguards sufficient to prevent the irresponsible summoning either of masters or men on frivolous charges. If arbitration is not thus made compulsory, strikes become inevitable, to the impoverishment of the country and the waste of its resources.

6. There are admittedly difficulties involved, but the question is are not those difficulties small when compared with the evils of allowing capital and labour to fight out their quarrel at the public loss ?

NO

1. Compulsory arbitration could not work out in practice for it would resolve itself into practical confiscation. If the men found it impossible to work at the wages offered, it would be a palpable injustice to fine them for refusing to obey a judgment that they should return to work, and public opinion would never allow them to be driven back to work at the point of the bayonet ; so with the masters it would be unjust to force them by fines to keep their works going at a loss, and barbarous to compel them with bayonets.

2. It appears, then, that if compulsory arbitration were to succeed, it would have to control the consumer as well as the producer ; if a man were forced to sell his goods at a certain price the public would have to be made to buy them at that price.

3. If the employer were thus coerced, he would be driven to adulterate his goods so as to cover his loss, or he would enter into a huge " combine " with other employers to control prices.

4. Gradually in this way all employers would be driven by the arbitration courts into these trusts, until at last

state socialism would be established at the point of the bayonet.

5. No arbitration court would have sufficient technical knowledge to settle the majority of trade disputes, and the whole system would be a violation of the rights of man, and indeed from the very fact of its being compulsory would cease to be arbitration.

6. A number of State functionaries would have to be created, and this would mean a large increase in taxation, with little prospect of any practical good results.

REFERENCES:—

The World of Labour, chap. ix. (1913): and *Self-Government in Industry* (1917), by G. D. H. Cole (Bell).

An Alphabet of Economics, by A. R. Orage (Fisher Unwin, 1917).

Power and Duty of an Arbitrator, by Francis Russell (Stevens, 1906).

Industrial Conciliation, by Henry Crompton (Kegan Paul, 1876).

London Chamber of Arbitration Law and Practice, by M. Shearman and Thomas W. Haycraft.

The Hope for Society: a symposium (Bell, 1919).

The State in Relation to Labour, by W. S. Jevons (Macmillan, 1910).

Economics, by Henry Clay (Macmillan, 1916).

Articles: "Labour from an Employer's Point of View," by E. D. Simon (*Contemporary Review*, May, 1918); "Voluntary Conciliation of Labour and Capital," by E. T. Good (*The World's Work*, March, 1916).

See also References for Debate on "Strikes."

IS BRITISH ART DECLINING ?

YES

1. If a nation becomes wealthy by producing commodities and selling them, so much attention is necessarily paid to the quantity of the goods that their quality becomes a secondary consideration, and this means the decline of art. Even where under present conditions quality is considered, it is only thought of for the purpose of selling.

2. The poor producing classes are so absorbed in the difficult struggle of making a living that they have not time to be artistic in their work, while the rich classes, not themselves producing art, become mere *dilettanti* ; thus true art declines.

3. As long as the nation's production is so entirely carried on by machinery, art is sure to be on the decline, and it cannot revive until the artisan again becomes an artist.

4. The commercial ideal is radically distinct from the artistic, and as long as England is under the dominion of the commercial ideal it is clear that art must decline.

5. This is ultimately a social question, for we see that as long as the present competition and consequent slavery of the masses exist, life must be ugly, and the instinct for the cultivation of the beautiful must decline.

6. Modern art is to an alarming extent abandoning the pursuit of the beautiful and the good, to devote itself to

the portrayal of the real, the ugly, and even the gross and sensual. Though many of the conventions of the past are now seen to be absurd, yet there is no occasion to rush to an opposite extreme which must mean the decline if not the ruin of art.

7. The proportion of born artists in any generation is small, and yet so large a number now rush into art that every sort of uncouth trickery with the brush is resorted to in order to draw attention to thousands of pictures which are essentially worthless. Competition in art thus encourages tendencies making for its decline.

8. "The world is everywhere growing uglier and more commonplace."—*Wm. Morris*.

9. If we look at the subject with the aid of history, we see that there has been a steady decline in art since the great days of Greece. Mr. Palgrave justly points out that we need only go to the British Museum and look at the Greek vases to be convinced that "A hundred nameless potters have here rivalled our selectest draughtsmen: Leonardo, Dürer, or Flaxman."

NO

1. The taste of the people is slowly but distinctly rising, with the result that in order to make goods sell an increasing regard must be paid to the artistic quality of the goods, and thus even our prosaic commercial spirit develops the artistic sense indirectly.

2. Although the present inequality of men has many deplorable elements in it, yet it has this good effect that it creates a wealthy leisured class who thereby become the natural patrons of art.

3. The art movement which condemns machinery is essentially reactionary, an impossible longing for the old times.

4. If England were to give up the commercial ideal and attempt to adopt the artistic, she would almost certainly go to the wall in competition with other nations. Commercialism is not so much a matter of choice as a stern necessity.

5. There is at present a keen revival of art among us, as is seen in the increasing taste for good illustration in books, for good bindings and good printing, in the success of art journalism and in the number of artists who manage to live well under present conditions.

6. Even the extremes of the so-called "decadent" school are indications of irrepressible artistic energy which must experiment before entering upon a new period of advance.

7. The keener the competition in art, the more certain is the development of a higher and better art in this country. The eagerness of the countless votaries of art is an indication of how strong is the life of the spirit of art among us.

8. There is every reason to believe that the ugliness of our age is but a passing phase. As further scientific advances are made, and electricity largely takes the place of steam, that which now can only be ugly will be capable of being made beautiful.

9. To point out that our art cannot be compared with that of Greece is not to prove that art is at present on the decline in England. That interest in art should be so widespread in these days of savage competition is a sign that there is in the nation a latent power of artistic development which is gradually learning to express itself.

REFERENCES :—

- British Contemporary Artists*, by W. Cosmo Monkhouse (Heinemann, 1899).
Nineteenth Century Art, by D. S. McColl (Maclehose, Glasgow, 1902).
Art in Great Britain and Ireland, by Sir W. Armstrong (Heinemann, 1909).

The Scottish School, by W. D. McKay (Duckworth, 1906).

The English Pre-Raphaelite Painters, by P. H. Bate (Bell, 1899).

Some of the Moderns, by Sir Fred. Wedmore (Virtue, 1909).

A History of Water-Colour Painting, by H. M. Cundall (Murray, 1908).

**The English School of Painting*, by E. Chesneau (Fine Art Library, 1884).

**History of Modern Painting*, by R. Muther (Dent, 1907).

The Great State : a symposium : section on " Art," by Roger Fry (Harper, 1912).

Art and Life, by T. Sturge Moore (Methuen, 1910).

The works of Ruskin and William Morris should be studied.

Articles : " A plea for Readjustment in the Art World," by R. C. Witt (*Nineteenth Century*, Aug., 1917). " Artistic Style and

its Factors," by Vernon Lee (*Contemporary Review*, July, 1916).

" Some Modern Movements in Painting," by William Strang (*Architect*, Feb. 25, 1916).

* These two writers express the French and German point of view on English painting.

ZIONISM

FOR

1. In spite of the fact that they have been scattered all over the face of the earth, and subjected to every variety of government, the Jews have managed to maintain a peculiar distinctness of race which is so remarkable as to make it a crying shame that this peculiar people should have no national home of their own. The object of Zionism is to provide such a home in Palestine, and this plan ought to meet with the unhesitating support of all liberal-minded persons.

2. Poland was one of the chief centres of Jewish life, where, under incredibly difficult conditions, the Jews maintained a sort of sub-national existence. The war has broken up this precarious nationality, and the question is now very insistent, what is to become of these Jews, thus scattered and ruined.

3. The Jews have not, of course, all their eggs in one basket, and there are other Jewries. But in other countries, the tendency is for the Jew to become assimilated to the particular nation in which he lives. He loses his Jewishness for want of some standard on which to form himself. This latter process is checked only by Anti-Semitism, which is nothing but unjust repression. The only way to preserve the Jewish nationality is to give them a home of their own.

4. Neither the herding of the Jews together in ghettos,

nor the permitting of individual Jews to live as free human beings outside the ghettos can possibly make up to the Jewish race for the lack of a centre of national life.

5. It is not, of course, intended to send all Jews to Palestine. This would be impossible, and besides, many Jews prefer to remain in the countries where they are. It would only be a minority which would find its way to Palestine, but, in any case, there would be a sufficient number to make the foundation of a definite Jewish state a practical possibility. Palestine will be the home of the Jews, not because all the Jews are there, but because there alone the Jews will be masters of their own destiny.

6. Small beginnings have already been made in Palestine, and these beginnings are very hopeful for the future. The Zionist organization itself has grown enormously, and has now 200,000 adherents in all parts of the world: it has a Congress, a network of financial institutions, and a very wide propaganda.

7. It is not supposed that the restoration of the Jews will immediately settle all the troubles of the Jews. They will have a hard struggle for existence, but at least they will have a fair chance.

8. The Jewish nation has stood, from time immemorial, for the loftiest of spiritual ideals. Its life has been a long tribute to the supremacy of the things of the spirit. The Zionist movement itself is a proof of the power of the ideal to stir the spirit of the Jews.

9. A new Jewish nation in Palestine would be most valuable as a mediator between East and West, because the Jews have their roots in the East, but a very wide experience and education in the West.

10. The principle of equality of opportunity for all nations demands that the Jews must also have their chance. It cannot be said that they have not taken their part in

the Great War, for Jews have fought in every army in Europe, and it is not their fault that their forces have been thus scattered.

AGAINST

1, 2, 3 and 4. Zionism is a breach of faith because the Jews were granted emancipation on the ground that they are a religious sect, and on condition that they would renounce all national ideals. Zionism is also a peril because it deprives the emancipated Jews of the very basis on which they have obtained civic liberty and equality: it also closes the gates of freedom for Jews who are not yet emancipated.

5. The Jews are a parasitic race who live on the prosperity of other nations. They are an adaptable and highly commercial race which excels in exploiting modern economic conditions, but they would fail miserably in Palestine for they would find it difficult to exploit each other, and they have no talent for the work of government.

6. It is possible to get up a "propaganda" for anything. Considering the vast sums of money behind this Zionist propaganda the results have been exceedingly small.

7. The Jews are very fairly treated as it is in most civilized nations. Where there is any oppression it is mostly caused by the overreaching commercial acuteness of the Jews themselves. Their keenness in taking advantage of the more easy-going Christian occasionally leads to regrettable reprisals.

8. So far from standing for lofty ideals Jews through the whole course of history have stood for money-making. Finance is their strong point, and in the amassing of money they have, with a few exceptions, shown more shrewdness than scrupulousness.

9. It would be dangerous to place them in this excep-

tionally favourable position between East and West, for the only result would be that they would exploit the situation to get the oriental trade into their own hands.

10. That the Jews have had all the chance they need is evidenced from the degree in which international finance is already in their hands : if they are to be given further opportunities the time may come when the mere Christian will have to " quit business."

REFERENCES :—

- Judaism*, by Ephraim Levine (Jack's Peoples' Books, 1912).
History of the Jews, by Paul Goodman (Temple Primers, 1911).
Jewish Life in Modern Times, by Israel Cohen (Methuen, 1914).
The Jews and Modern Capitalism, by Werner Sombart (Fisher Unwin, 1913).
The History of Zionism, by Nahum Sokolow (Longmans, 1919).
Zionism : a symposium (Fisher Unwin, 1916).
Zionism and the Jewish Future : a symposium (Murray, 1917).
The Jews of To-Day, by Arthur Ruppin (Bell, 1913).
Palestine and the Jews, by F. G. Jannaway (Walker, Birmingham, 1914.)
England and Palestine, by Herbert Sidebotham (Constable, 1919).
Palestine of the Jews, by Norman Bentwich (Kegan Paul, 1919).
 Articles : " The Jewish National Movement," by Lucien Wolf (*Edinburgh Review*, April, 1917). " The Jewish Claim to Palestine," by Joseph Cowen (*Contemporary Review*, June, 1917). " Zionism," by Canon Barry (*Dublin Review*, Sept., 1918).
The English Zionist Federation publishes literature on the subject.

BOLSHEVISM

FOR

1. "The war of 1914 is the most colossal breakdown in history of an economic system destroyed by its own inherent contradictions."—*Leon Trotsky*.

2. The forces of production evolved by capitalism have outgrown the limits of any particular nation. The carefully laid German plan to unite "Mittel Europa" under their direction is evidence that they realized that their capitalism had expanded beyond the limits of Germany. In this way the single great power is giving place to the imperialistic world power. This inevitable process is putting the old patriotism out of date, and the proletariat have certainly no interest in maintaining it, but demand "The Republican United States of Europe."

3 The plutocracy want to exploit imperialistic world power in their own interest, the bourgeoisie have become completely demoralized by the progress of industry and blindly support the plutocracy. It is only the proletariat which sees the complete bankruptcy of the old regime and which has any scheme for a new one.

4. War is the method by which capitalism seeks to consolidate and increase its power and to solve its problems of expansion; the proletariat opposes to this its own method, namely, the social revolution.

5. The failure of the "International" has been brought

about because the old socialist parties were really national, and they have fallen along with the nations to which they belong. "It is not socialism which has gone down, but its temporary, historical, external form."—*Trotsky*.

6. Might is the mother of right. This is the lesson which capitalism has always taught in its practices. This is the lesson which the proletariat of Europe has learned from its capitalist teachers. "Iron necessity is now shaking its fist at all the rules of capitalistic society, at its laws, its morality, its religion."—*Trotsky*.

7. "Millions will rise up under our banner, millions who even now, sixty-seven years after the communist manifesto, *have nothing to lose but their chains.*"

AGAINST

1. The war of 1914 was a criminal plot made by the German military party. It was not the breakdown of the economic system, and even if it were, that contention would be no justification for Bolshevism, which is not an alternative system, but merely anarchy supported by terror.

2. This argument would be valid in favour of a League of Nations. Questions of Capital and Labour are now international and should be dealt with by the League of Nations. If Bolshevism were supreme there would be no "Republican United States of Europe," but only universal terror maintained by bestial savagery.

3. Our present economic system has many faults and is much behind the enlightened thinking of the day, but that is no reason for throwing it overboard and relapsing into chaos. It has taken centuries of effort and suffering to build up the present system, which now is in need of a big further development by which abuses and injustices may be removed. It would be economic suicide to sacrifice the whole system, especially when the only alternative suggested is the pro-

letariat scheme which has brought total ruin to Russia.

4. The cruelties of social revolution cannot be excused by the crimes of war. It is not capitalism, but militarism which makes war. War is destructive to the economic system and would never be waged by a great commercial nation except in self-defence, or as in the case of Germany, when that nation is in reality ruled by professional soldiers.

5. "Bolshevism means the undermining and overthrowal of democratic principles and ideals just as it assuredly means the destruction of the fundamentals of moral, social and industrial organization."—*Grand Duke Alexander of Russia*.

6. We fought for over four years to prove that might is not the mother of right, as military autocracy maintains, and now the vile despotism of anarchy raises the same cry. Truly extremes meet, and the one is as false and cruel as the other. Real progress will become impossible until this false doctrine is finally nailed to the counter. —

7. It is true that Bolshevism is recruited from landless men and industrial slaves, who have nothing to lose. Reconstruction must make it possible for every man to have "a stake in the country." The ghastly excesses of Bolshevism have shown the danger to society of masses of men "who have nothing to lose." Nothing but a sane and genuine reconstruction can save modern society from the bloodiest terror which has ever existed, namely—Bolshevism.

REFERENCES :—

- The Prelude to Bolshevism*, by A. F. Kerensky (Fisher Unwin, 1919).
Russia and the Struggle for Peace, by M. S. Farbman (Allen & Unwin, 1918).
The Bolshevik Revolution, by Maxim Litvinoff (Brit. Soc. Party, 1919).
War or Revolution, by Leon Trotsky (Socialist Labour Press, 1918).
Russia's Ruin, by E. H. Wilcox (Chapman & Hall, 1919).
The History of the Russian Revolution, by Leon Trotsky (Allen & Unwin, 1919).

A Collection of Reports on Bolshevism in Russia (Stationery Office, 1919).

Articles : "Bolshevik Ideals and their Failure," by Dr. Hagberg Wright (*Contemporary Review*, Nov. 1918). "The Repercussion of Bolshevism in Asia," by "Treaty Port" (*Contemporary Review*, March, 1918).

Pamphlets are published by the Russian Liberation Committee, the British Socialist Party, and the Socialist Labour Press.

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR IRELAND

FOR

1. The Irish are a race by themselves with special, well-marked characteristics. They are a conquered race, which has been made and kept part of the British Empire by force. They have demanded their freedom steadily since 1870, and it is a violation of the great principle of self-determination of small nations to keep them any longer in unwilling servitude.

2. The Union with Great Britain has always been a case of the exploitation of the weaker nation by the stronger—an exploitation intolerable in the eyes of modern enlightenment. At present the rule of Dublin Castle strangles the whole trade of the country, and not only so, but the very cost of this government is in itself excessive, *e.g.* in 1911 the civil government cost in England about 29s. 2*d.*, in Scotland 33s. 4*d.*, and in Ireland 51s. 9*d.* per head, according to a Treasury statement.

3. The fallacy of many of the usual arguments against Irish self-government may be seen from a consideration of the fact that Canada at one time was in almost exactly the same situation as Ireland is in to-day. In Canada there were two creeds, Catholic and Protestant, two races, English and French, two parties, Bureaucratic and Democratic. It was held to be dangerous to grant autonomy to Canada for fear that the concession would remove every check to

the power of the dominant and tyrannical majority, which was inferior to the minority in wealth, education and enterprise. History has proved the falseness of this contention in the case of Canada, and is ready to prove its falseness in the case of Ireland.

4. The most serious objection to granting self-government to Ireland arises from the fear that injustice would be done to Ulster—loyal, Protestant, prosperous, wealthy, well-educated and enterprising Ulster. The force of this argument is dissipated by the following considerations:—

- (a) Ulster cannot claim to represent Protestantism, because as a matter of fact the Catholics are the predominating sect.
- (b) Criminal statistics show that Ulster is far from being the most law-abiding part of Ireland.
- (c) Statistics of illiteracy show Ulster to be only third on the list.
- (d) Ulster is not even the wealthiest district, for Leinster is richer.
- (e) Though Belfast has increased in population, the nine counties of Ulster have decreased—is this prosperity?
- (f) Can Ulstermen be called progressive when they have systematically opposed all reform—Catholic emancipation, abolition of tithes, the extension of the franchise, the disestablishment of the Church, the reform of the land laws, the extension of local self-government, the new university for Dublin, the Development Scheme and Home Rule?

5. Bigotry raises the cry that if self-government were granted to Ireland the power of the Catholic Church would become a menace to all free institutions. This fear is unfounded, because Democracy would keep down any undue pretension, as it has done in Italy and in France.

As a matter of fact also there are far more Protestant clergymen in proportion to the Protestant inhabitants than Catholic priests in proportion to the Catholic inhabitants. In 1905 there was one priest to about 934 Catholics, while there was one parson to about 331 Protestants.

6. The fear that an independent Irish parliament would raise tariff barriers against British goods is a chimera, because Great Britain is Ireland's best customer and to erect tariff barriers would only be to provoke retaliatory measures on the part of Great Britain.

7. Wherever Autonomy has been granted, loyalty has been the reward. Ireland was a constant danger during the Great War, because she had this grievance: remove this chain of serfdom and in any future war she will show that gratitude is not a quality confined to South Africans, Australians and Canadians.

8. "Where else but in Ireland do men plume themselves on esteeming their fellow-countrymen unfit for the management of their own affairs?"—*Alfred Webb*.

AGAINST

1. The inhabitants of Ireland are about four millions, while the inhabitants of the rest of the United Kingdom number about forty millions; is it right that the vital interest of forty millions should be sacrificed to the fanatical and extreme demands of four millions?

2. The proportion of the burden of governing the United Kingdom which falls upon Ireland has been grossly exaggerated, and the incalculable benefits derived by Ireland from this government have been suppressed, in the effort to build up an argument which sounds plausible, but which has no solid foundation in fact.

3. In the argument from Canada the great difference in geographical situation is ignored, yet this difference is vital, for it is impossible for the mother country to deal

effectively with the internal affairs of Canada on account of the distance which separates them, while the affairs of Ireland can be dealt with as readily as those of Scotland.

4. To give self-government to Ireland would be a gross injustice to loyal Ulster, because although the people of Ulster are a minority in Ireland, they claim their inalienable right to be reckoned with the vast majority in the United Kingdom who are solid for the Union. The question is not a purely Irish one : it is a national question, and the national majority is behind Ulster.

5. "Home Rule means Rome Rule." If it were not for the priests the whole agitation would expire in face of the fact that the United Kingdom has taken every possible means to remove every well-founded Irish grievance. The Irish priest is dreaming of "Temporal Power," and if there were an Irish Parliament it would not be long before the position of all Protestants in Ireland would become intolerable.

6. The Irish are for the most part unpractical idealists. If an Irish parliament were set up, it would proceed to indulge in all sorts of wild-cat legislation with results disastrous to the country. It is not denied that the Irish have been unjustly treated in the past. There has been too much coercion and too little sympathetic understanding, but these dark days are long past and should be forgotten in view of the successive and successful efforts made to remove every real injustice and to find a working solution for every difficulty. Not only has Parliament not been indifferent to Irish questions, but it has devoted an altogether disproportionate amount of time to their solution, and Ireland would now be a happy and contented member of the United Kingdom if it were not for the fact that the Irish agitators are irreconcilable.

7. The great majority of those who are in favour of self-

government for Ireland do not realize what it means. They deceive themselves into the idea that it is some sort of Federalism that is demanded, but this is not the case. The Irish want to become an independent nation. It is disruption they want and not Federation. How disastrous such a mistake might be is seen most clearly in the Great War. If Ireland had been independent she might have gone over to the Germans altogether, instead of merely playing the secret traitor. The Irish regiments covered themselves with glory, while the disaffected Irish visionaries conspired with the Germans. If self-government were granted the visionaries would get the upper hand and the days of the United Kingdom would be numbered.

8. The most flourishing system of corruption in the whole world (except perhaps Bolshevism) is the rule of Tammany in New York, and this is a peculiarly Irish institution. Can we wonder that the people of Ulster are ready to go to any extremes to preserve the Union, which is the only guarantee of order and justice in Ireland.

REFERENCES :—

Home Rule, by L. G. Redmond-Howard (Jack's Peoples' Books, 1912).

The National Being, by A. E. (Geo. W. Russell) (Maunsel, 1916).

The Legacy of Past Years, by Lord Dunraven (Murray, 1912).

Ireland in the New Century, by Sir Horace Plunkett (Murray, 1905).

The Soul of Ulster, by Lord Ernest Hamilton (Hurst & Blacket, 1917).

An Irish Apologia, by Warre B. Wells.

A Fool's Paradise, by Prof. Dicey (Murray, 1913).

The Historic Case for Irish Independence, by Darrell Figgis (Maunsel, 1918).

History of the Irish Rebellion of 1916; and *The Irish Convention and Sinn Féin* (1918), by Warre B. Wells and N. Marlowe (Maunsel).

The Land they Loved, novel, by G. D. Cummins (Macmillan, 1919).

Article on "The Irish Question," by Sir Horace Plunkett, in *The Round Table*, Dec., 1914.

Maunsel & Co., of Dublin, publish a very large number of pamphlets and small books on every side of the question.

SHOULD CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BE ABOLISHED ?

NO

1. Society has a moral right to inflict the death penalty if a strong case of necessity can be made out.

2. No punishment is so deterrent as death.

(a) Though death may happen at any time, yet in most men's minds the possibility is usually considered pretty remote ; but in the case of contemplated murder a man knows that he has certain death before him, and the deterrent effect of this close prospect of the gallows is very marked.

(b) Crimes visited with capital punishment are rarely committed in sudden fury, for there is ample provision for these crimes in the law of manslaughter. In the other case, where the fury gradually grows upon a man, the consciousness that capital punishment is part of the law acts as a steady deterrent.

(c) The mental sufferings of the condemned are not altogether secret, for his relatives see them, and besides, the imagination of the public invests the gallows with even a greater horror than it possesses. All this constitutes a powerful and widespread check upon crime.

(d) The only alternative which can be suggested is perpetual imprisonment, and this is not nearly so deterrent as capital punishment, because a convict never realizes what is meant by perpetual imprison-

ment, and always has the hope that something will happen to set him free.

3. There are tolerably secure guarantees under present conditions against the infliction of the death penalty upon the innocent. The knowledge that any miscarriage of justice is irreparable secures that great care is taken both by the public and the court that the proof of guilt is satisfactory. If life imprisonment were to be substituted for the capital sentence, then this minute care would not be uniformly taken, because the life sentence can be modified at any time, yet a sentence which can at any time be reversed is usually never reversed at all.

4. Capital punishment is more reformatory than perpetual imprisonment. The prospect of imminent death usually brings the criminal to remorse, whereas perpetual imprisonment only hardens him.

5. Capital punishment alone satisfies the natural desire for retribution felt both by the relatives of the victim and by the public. Mill says that "rulers show most emphatically their regard for human life by the adoption of a rule that he who violates that right in another shall forfeit it for himself, and that while no other crime that he can commit shall deprive him of his right to live, this—the wilfully taking away life—shall." A resolute effort is made by legal tribunals to compel the plaintiff to abandon his private desire for revenge, and to place his case in the hands of the law; the law having taken this responsibility must discharge it by the infliction of the death penalty where fully deserved.

6. Statistical arguments against capital punishment are not trustworthy, because there are so many different kinds of cases and so many varying degrees of guilt that to arrive at accurate statistics for establishing a case against the infliction of capital punishment is out of the question.

YES

1. Crime is a disease, and all punishment should be reformatory in character.

2. The teaching of history leads us inevitably to the conclusion that the death penalty is not deterrent ; in the days when men were hanged for theft, crime was more prevalent than it is now.

(a) Death may happen at any time, and as this fact does not materially influence us in our saner moments how can we expect it to deter criminals acting under a powerful passion ?

(b) Murders, whether premeditated or not, are always committed by a man when he is labouring under an irresistible passion. Under these circumstances nothing will deter him ; intelligent and sympathetic moral training is the only deterrent.

(c) The mental agony of the condemned is endured in secret, and as the public can never know the horror of his remorse, it can have no deterrent effect upon future murderers.

(d) It must be admitted that our present system of penal servitude has as little deterrent effect as hanging, but it has been abundantly proved at such institutions as the Elmira State Reformatory that under enlightened discipline and education a criminal can be gradually developed into a useful citizen.

3. It is greatly to be feared that more often than we imagine has an innocent man been hanged. Circumstantial evidence is not reliable, and though this fact is generally admitted, prisoners are freely condemned upon evidence which the best legal experts admit to be essentially dubious.

4. Capital punishment is not reformatory at all, but is merely retributive. All possibility of making some atonement for his past is violently taken away from the prisoner, and time is left him only for a sentimental, not for a prac-

tical, repentance. The only existing alternative is penal servitude for life, which is equally barbarous, but it is not the only possible alternative.

5. This is merely the old-world cry of blood for blood, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. It is time the world was outgrowing this discredited cry. Vengeance is not justice, even when it is exacted by the State. As long as the State sets this example of vengeance, it will be impossible to teach the people higher principles.

6. Statistics prove beyond doubt that capital punishment has failed in its purpose, and has only succeeded in dignifying crime with the name of tragedy. The severer the penalty is made, the more crime increases; never was crime more prevalent than in the Middle Ages, and never were the penalties for crime more ferocious. Belief in the efficacy of capital punishment must pass away as a superstition of barbarism.

REFERENCES :—

The Penalty of Death, by J. Oldfield (1901).

Capital Punishment, by E. D. Girdlestone (1904).

The Death Penalty, by Mrs. Bradlaugh-Bonner (1908). An excellent twopenny pamphlet published by the Humanitarian League.

Death, by Maurice Maeterlinck.

Butler's Sermons, viii. and ix.

Article, "The Case against C. P.," by B. Paul Neuman (*Fortnightly Review*, vol. xlvi. (new series, p. 322)..

Article in *The Spectator*, vol. lvii., p. 343.

Article, "C.P. in England," by F. W. Rowsell, in *Contemporary Review*, vol. xxviii., p. 628.

Article, "The Scriptural Argument for C.P." in *The Dublin University Magazine*, vol. lxxv., p. 414.

Article, "In Praise of Hanging," by W. S. Lilly, in *New Review*, vol. xi. p. 19.

Article, "Ought C.P. to be Abolished?" by G. R. Vicars, in *Westminster Review*, vol. cxliii., p. 561.

Various useful pamphlets are published by the Humanitarian League, the Penal Reform League, the Howard Association, and the Society for the Abolition of Capital Punishment.

DO CHARITY ORGANIZATION SOCIETIES DO GOOD OR HARM ?

GOOD

1. The present methods of assisting the poor are so multifarious, having different objects and different ways of working, that through their competition much philanthropic energy is wasted, and there is great need of that co-ordination and concentration of effort which it is the aim of charity organization societies to effect.

2. The relief of the poor must be put upon scientific lines, or the result is that the poor are as often pauperized as really assisted. It is generally admitted that the old methods of relief do almost as much harm as good for want of intelligence and thorough scientific treatment of the cases. It is this need and this defect with which these societies successfully deal.

3. Their unpopularity among the poor is just an indication of their success, for it shows that the idle and vicious do not get the encouragement they too often receive under private, miscellaneous charity. Any effective, discriminating treatment of the poor is sure to be unpopular, just because it is effective and discriminating.

4. The societies have achieved extraordinary success, considering that it is the very worst cases which are usually sent to them.

5. The associated charities are not responsible for the present social system, and though it is impossible to

eliminate all abuse from the administration of charity, yet the organization societies are doing the best relief work possible under the present conditions, and they are steadily becoming more effective.

HARM

1. These societies do not go to the root of the evil, which is the present severe social inequality, and they supply an easy way for the well-to-do to salve their consciences, and quietly to adopt a *laissez-faire* attitude towards the social question,—it is so easy and meritorious to contribute to the funds of a society.

2. These societies come between the rich and the poor, and prevent that direct knowledge and personal dealing which are so essential, and introduce instead a system of red-tape and suspicion.

3. The investigation of cases leads to much injustice, as the visitors often do not realize the economic conditions of the life of the poor, and make arbitrary distinctions between deserving and undeserving cases. It is forgotten that the poor are sensitive, and resent the intrusion of these visitors into the private details of their family life. Patronizing philanthropy is almost as odious as ostentatious piety.

4. These societies, by constantly urging the poor to self-help, are holding up a standard of individualism which is impossible and reactionary, and tend to blind the community to the real economic trouble.

5. There should be no need of alms, but efforts should be made to bring about conditions under which all can obtain work. The rich really live upon the work of the poor, and for these rich, without attempting to alter the present conditions, to exhort the poor to self-help is an insult and a mockery.

REFERENCES :—

- The New Encyclopædia of Social Reform*, edited by W. D. P. Bliss (1909).
- The Charities Annual Register and Digest*.
- Relief of the Deserving Poor* (1898) : *The Moral Effects of Charity* (1900) ; *Pauperism or Self-Effort ?* (1903) ; *Poverty : a Social Disease* (1905) ; pamphlets by W. E. Chadwick (Christian Knowledge Society).
- A Council of Social Welfare*, by T. Hancock Nunn (The Hampstead Scheme).
- Charitable Relief*, by C. F. Rogers (Longmans, 1904).
- Chalmers on Charity*, by N. Masterman (Constable, 1900).
- The Heart of the Empire* : a symposium. Chap. vi. (Fisher Unwin, 1901).
- The Charity Organization Society issues many Reports, pamphlets, and a monthly magazine dealing with its work.

ARE THE CHURCHES ON THE DOWN- GRADE ?

NO

1. The reason why church attendance is falling off is because it is no longer necessary for respectability to go to church, nor is it fashionable to go ; so this falling off does not necessarily mean loss, but may only be the shedding of dead leaves.

2. These are times of transition from a view of the Bible and of Christian doctrine which had not sufficient basis and had to pass away. The effect has been the disintegration of the old system of belief. The newer views are much more intelligent and are based on unassailable grounds, resting ultimately on the deepest intuitions of the human spirit. Times of transition are necessarily times of loss. The destruction of the old is now giving place to the construction of the new, so that the churches are now distinctly on the up-grade.

3. Among so many clergy there must be some who are inefficient, but on the whole wherever there is a capable and earnest preacher his church is well attended.

4. It is a very difficult task to alter a creed which has long been generally recognized. The faith of the Church, however, is far in advance of its creed and the best modern theology is philosophically sound.

5. If the matter were carefully inquired into, it would be found that the great majority of the contributions which

support charitable work of all sorts come from within the churches. The strength of the churches is seen in the extraordinary success of the innumerable special funds raised for philanthropic purposes as well as for missionary enterprise.

6. The great work of the Y.M.C.A. originated in the churches, and it is only on account of the divisions among them that it has a separate organization. This conspicuously successful movement is alone a sufficient answer to the question in debate.

7. Voltaire prophesied the collapse of Christianity in fifty years ; and in fifty years thereafter the very house in which he made that prophecy was a depot for the circulation of the Bible. Bishop Butler reported the common opinion that all that remained for Christianity was decent obsequies, and a few years later the great revival began under Wesley and Whitefield. Even the Great War is not the final eclipse of Christianity and the boldest prophets are not always the truest seers.

8. The volatile public has always been ready to run after new " fancy " religions such as Theosophy, Spiritualism, etc., but these crazes never last long, nor seriously affect the steady progress of the Church on the up-grade.

YES

1. If statistics of church attendance could be taken to-day and compared with those of thirty or forty years ago the results would be startling. There is a universal falling away of the people from the churches.

2. The churches in the main have only two things to offer us, either sacerdotalism or evangelicalism. Both of these systems have been given a full and fair trial at the bar of history and have failed. The churches with a blind con-

servatism cling to these systems and are on the down-grade with them.

3. The Church does not take the intelligence of the laity into account, does not or will not understand that the laity see through all skilful attempts to bolster up doctrinal views which were all very well in the middle ages, but which can neither stand against modern criticism nor avail anything to satisfy modern need.

4. Advanced thought is so universal among the more intelligent clergy that they cannot conceal from the people the fact that they no longer believe their own creeds. The clergy dare not, however, say plainly what they do believe, but are forced continually to adapt their real views as far as possible to their out-of-date creeds. This leads to much juggling with words, hair-splittings, ingenious accommodations and uncomfortable manœuvres. If the churches are to survive we must first of all set the clergy free from the trammels of their mediæval creeds, which are mere travesties of Christ's simple teaching.

5. The masses are becoming daily more alienated from a Church which exhorts them so fervently to humility and patience, and does so little for the betterment of their condition. Charity doles are only cheap and convenient ways of evading the real difficulties. Even among the classes the Church has but little real influence—meanness, exploitation and ostentatious luxury flourish, for it is hardly possible for the preacher to say anything unpleasant to the very people who are paying his salary.

6. The great success of the Y.M.C.A. is beside the point, because this success is not attributable to the fact that the movement started in the Church, but to the fact that it separated itself from the Church in order to establish itself on its present broad and human basis.

7. How much the churches are on the down-grade is

seen most clearly in the light of the conflagration of the Great War. The nations which have been fighting are the leading Christian nations, in each of which the Church was in a very powerful position, and yet all those churches succeeded in doing nothing to prevent the war. Also during the progress of the war the general verdict has been that the Church has failed to make use of the great opportunities she had to comfort and sustain the people during the fearful ordeal. The Church is again failing after the war to cope with the lamentable tendency of the people to relapse into the same old sordid materialism, so universal before the catastrophe.

8. The remarkable spread of Theosophy, Spiritualism and even Christian Science is strong evidence that the churches are on the down-grade and that the people are turning away from them in their disappointment at discovering that what they took to be bread turns out to be only a stone.

REFERENCES:—

- Religion : a criticism and a forecast*, by G. Lowes Dickenson (Dent, 1912).
The Church of England ; its Nature and its Future : a symposium (University of London Press, 1919).
The Time Spirit, by R. Dimsdale Stocker (Erskine McDonald, 1913).
Conventional Lies of our Civilization, by Max Nordau (Heinemann).
The Decay of the Churches, by Joseph McCabe (Methuen, 1909).
The Churches at the Crossroads, by J. H. Shakespeare (Williams & Norgate, 1918).
The Outlook for Religion, by W. E. Orchard (Cassell, 1917).
Lex Orandi (1903) ; *Lex Credendi* (1906) ; and *Christianity at the Crossroads* (1909), by Father Tyrrell (Longmans).
The Religion of To-morrow, by W. J. Colville (Rider & Son, 1917).
Article : " Is the Church losing its power ? " by W. P. Paterson, in the *Constructive Quarterly* (Oxford), Dec. 1916.
The official Year-books issued by the various churches furnish statistics.

OUGHT THE CHURCH TO ADVOCATE SOCIAL REFORM ?

YES

1. Christ's chief work was among the poor and needy, and unless the Church catches His spirit in deed as well as in word, she cannot claim to be His representative.

2. The kingdom which Christ came to establish was a kingdom of righteousness, and that kingdom evidently cannot be established unless the many injustices and tyrannies of our present social condition be remedied, and the Church cannot hope to remedy these abuses if she ignores them.

3. Christ taught the brotherhood of man not in an ideal, but in a practical sense, and this brotherhood cannot be reached apart from social reform.

4. Christ made such strenuous attacks upon hypocrisy and formality, and laid such stress upon practical righteousness, that it is evidently the Church's first duty to interest herself in questions of practical, social righteousness, and these matters should be considered of more importance than formal public worship.

5. The very fact that the question is raised at all shows how far the Church has wandered from the teaching of Christ, and how little she represents His Spirit.

6. If the present condition of things is in accordance with irrevocable laws of political economy, and any altera-

tion would mean ruin, then it should be boldly confessed that Christ's ideal is visionary and has little meaning for modern life.

NO

1. The Church recognizes that her chief work is among the poor and has always been the first to represent their claims and to initiate philanthropic effort ; but

2. The only way to make a perfect society is to make perfect men and women, and thus the Church should not so much address herself to external social conditions as to inward spiritual conditions.

3. Society as a whole will never be perfected. The State does not, and cannot, exist on Christian principles. Christ Himself said, " My kingdom is not of this world."

4. Christ was really an individualist ; His message was to the individual, and therefore individual development is the first aim of the Church.

5. Christian Socialists forget that any permanent social reform is impossible until the prevalent selfish materialism is abandoned and an altruistic idealism takes its place. To bring about this change is the chief work of the Church.

6. Christian Socialists are apt to forget the reign of law. There is no danger greater than this, that by means of glowing and ill-considered rhetoric the mass of the people may be led to hope for a state of society impossible in view of the laws of nature. If the Church is to take an interest in social reform, good can only result from careful, scientific thinking and investigating, and only evil can result from indulgence in popular rhetoric. If these contentions are true it is plain that the Church is wise if she keep herself to her true spiritual work.

REFERENCES :—

- Towards Social Reform* (Fisher Unwin, 1909); *Religion and Politics* (Wells Gardner, 1911); and *Practicable Socialism* (Longmans, 1915), by Canon and Mrs. S. A. Barnett.
- The Church and Citizenship*, by Richard Sheppard (1912).
- Social Idealism*, by R. Dimsdale Stocker (Williams & Norgate, 1910).
- Stephen Remarx* (Newnes, 1901); and *The Parson in Socialism* (Mowbray, 1910), by Canon Adderley.
- Socialism in Church History*, by Conrad Noel (Palmer, 1910).
- Social Service : its Place in the Society of Friends*, by Joshua Rowntree (Longmans, 1915).
- Social Work* (Anglican Church Handbooks, 1909); *Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity* (Longmans, 1910); by the Rev. W. E. Chadwick.
- The Church in the Commonwealth*, by R. Roberts (New Commonwealth Series, vol. ii. 1917).
- The Great State* : a symposium, chap. xi. "The Church" (Harper, 1912).
- Articles* : "Church Work," by John E. Mercer; and "Social Worship," by Lester Leake Riley, in the *Constructive Quarterly*, June, 1916.

IS THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO BLAME FOR THE ALIENATION OF WORKING MEN ? —

YES

1. Every effort to reach the facts establishes that the vast majority of the members and supporters of the churches are well-to-do people, while the percentage of working men who even attend churches is very small : it is also found that these working men uniformly declare that the churches show no practical sympathy with them, except in doling out a pittance of charity to palliate their inaction.

2. Working men "are never weary of comparing the lives and salaries of modern ministers" with the life and salary of Christ : they also do not believe that clergymen say what they really think, but confine themselves to what they are supposed to think. For these and other reasons (*e.g.* the total failure of so many Christians to apply their creed to their lives) they believe the churches to be organized shams run in the interest of the upper classes. They claim that it is thus the Church's own fault that the working men are alienated from her.

3. They also compare the modern with the primitive Church, and show how the Church has become progressively "mammonized," until now she is half unconscious of the fact.

4. When working men are so remarkably agreed in criticizing the Church on these and other lines, it is impos-

sible to avoid the conclusion that they have some justice on their side, and that the Church is to blame for having alienated them.

NO

1. It is not the fault of the Church that the working men are hostile, for the Church has initiated and supported the large majority of the philanthropic efforts of modern times, and in this way has practically shown her interest in the working classes.

2. It is one of the principles of Christianity that he who preaches the Gospel should live by the Gospel. As a matter of fact, the salaries of clergymen are not excessive, and even where they are, upon inquiry it would be found that a fair proportion is devoted to charity. The Church necessarily falls far short of her ideal, and the reason of this is not that the Church is unworthy, but that her ideal is so lofty. Working men themselves are to blame for separating themselves from the Church in this hypercritical manner.

3. The conditions of modern society are so different from those of ancient society that the same methods are no longer applicable. The Church must move with the times, and the fact that modern Church machinery differs from ancient is no condemnation of the modern, but merely an indication that the world has advanced.

4. The Church has hitherto survived all attacks, and she need not now fear the hostility of working men, knowing that that hostility is based upon a series of charges easily refutable, and that only patience is needed until these refutations sink into the minds of her opponents.

REFERENCES :—

The Incarnation and Common Life, and Social Aspects of Christianity (Macmillan), by Dr. B. F. Westcott.

Rough Talks by a Padre (Hodder & Stoughton, 1918), and other books by the military chaplain, the Rev. G. A. Studdert-Kennedy.

The Socialist's Church, by Stewart Headlam (Labour Ideals Series, 1907).

The Heart of the Empire: a symposium. Sections I. and VIII. (Fisher Unwin, 1908).

The Outlook for Religion, by W. E. Orchard (Cassell, 1917).

The Idea of a Free Church, by Henry Sturt (Walter Scott, 1909).

Socialism and Religion, by Stewart Headlam, Percy Dearmer, John Clifford, and John Woolman (Fabian Society, 1908).

Articles: "Democracy and Religion," by R. G. Parsons (*Contemporary Review*, Sept. 1918). "The Real Basis of Democracy," by Edmond Holmes (*Nineteenth Century*, Aug. 1917).

See References given for Debate on "Church and Social Reform."

IS MODERN CIVILIZATION A FAILURE ?

NO

1. Civilization has an irresistible tendency to refine men, beginning with the upper classes and spreading to the lower.

2. It increases the severity of the struggle for existence, and so calls forth the full faculties of an increasing number of men, to the benefit of the whole race.

3. We have only to compare the state of society to-day with what it used to be, and we cannot fail to see progress : the state of medicine proves this in regard to the body, of education in relation to the mind, and the state of public opinion in relation to morals.

4. As civilization increases, fewer and fewer people live in idleness, with the result that the whole character of life is raised.

5. The social problems which civilization brings with it are temporary in their nature. They are the birth-throes of a better time. A barbarous ignorance can never be called bliss, even though increase of knowledge may often mean increase of pain.

6. Civilization brings the opportunity of true freedom, which is only found in the voluntary submission of personal interest to public good.

7. Civilization increases vastly the capacity for enjoyment in the whole human race. We owe to it music, the theatre, sport.

8. We owe nearly all the comforts of life to civilization. We are indebted to it for the very arm-chair from which we try to condemn it.

9. Our cities are often condemned for their slums, their vices and their dreary routine, yet the most virile men are brought up in cities. Great opportunities are always beset by great temptations.

10. The most striking success of modern civilization is seen in the recent history of the Japanese.

YES

1. It has produced and fostered a cruel, calculating selfishness : its gospel is self-help, its creed is grab.

2. Civilization encourages artificiality of life, hypocrisy, inequality, tyranny and misery.

3. It saps the basis of morality and manliness by giving rise to effeminacy, luxury and artificial vice.

4. Nothing can save society except a return to a simpler life.

5. The apparent improvement in society brought about by civilization is merely in external matters while the spirit of society is degenerating.

Social problems are not temporary, but permanent. They increase in number and complexity. Our vaunted civilization is in its death-agonies. Though our knowledge is sufficient to find a remedy, the evil habit of the thing makes every effort end in futility.

6. Civilization is organized slavery. The rich are slaves of their own wealth, while the poor are the helpless bondsmen of the rich. We pride ourselves on the abolition of the slave-trade, but seldom notice how civilization has enslaved us all.

7. The so-called pleasure which civilization brings with it is at best fitful and feverish. We are all so busy making

a living that we have no time to live. Real happiness is in the home, in friendship, social intercourse and the like—all of which demand considerable leisure, and civilization has robbed the world of leisure.

8. The conveniences introduced by civilization are the only items on the credit side and these only affect our external surroundings. There is more widespread discontent now than ever before. Materialism is rampant. It is hard to find any ideal in which the people have any real faith. A system which produces such lamentable results is a failure.

9. Our great cities are a characteristic feature of modern civilization, which is condemned just as much by their luxury as by their squalor.

10. The Japanese are losing their art in gaining their arms, are selling the ancient beauty and poetry of their life for money and markets—always preferring a mess of pottage to their birthright. But this is only one instance—look at Germany, probably the most highly civilized country of all, plunging the whole world into war—a very carnival of civilization!

REFERENCES :—

Short Studies on Great Subjects, by J. A. Froude (Longmans).

Herbert Spencer's *Essay on Progress*.

Conventional Lies of our Civilization and Degeneration, by Max Nordau.

Regeneration : a reply to Max Nordau (Constable, 1895).

The Origin of Civilization, by Sir John Lubbock.

The Law of Civilization and Decay, by Brooks Adams (Macmillan)

Civilization and Progress, by J. Beattie Crozier (Longmans).

Civilization : its Cause and Cure, by Edward Carpenter (Sonnen-schein, 1902).

The Science of Power, by Benjamin Kidd (Methuen, 1918).

The Living Past (1915) and *The Century of Hope* (1919), by F. S. Marvin (Oxford Univ. Press).

The Golden Bough, by Sir J. G. Frazer,

OUGHT WE TO CONTINUE SOME FORM OF CONSCRIPTION IN GREAT BRITAIN ?

YES

1. The very fact that before the war we had no conscription was one of the indirect causes of the war. Our defenceless position was an overwhelming temptation to a military power like Germany.

2. We owe the victory to conscription, and though our voluntary army proved its inestimable value, nevertheless it would be folly to revert to a system which almost spelt our ruin.

3. It is not of course necessary or desirable to maintain enormous conscript armies in peace time, but the contention is that every capable man should be compelled to undergo a course of military training, so that if ever again any nation should yield to the lust of world-conquest we could raise a thoroughly efficient citizen army quickly.

4. The startling developments of aerial warfare have completely changed our circumstances. We are no longer immune from invasion so long as our fleet holds the seas. Future wars will be so sudden and devastating that there will be no time to train men—only the man who learnt his discipline and rifle-practice during peace will be any use.

5. There is no danger of a democracy ever using its citizen army for aggression or conquest, because war involves

so great a sacrifice on the part of the majority of the nation that the people are very unwilling to vote for it.

6. There is great moral and educational value in military discipline, which is at the same time the best means of obtaining a good general average of physical fitness. Sport, although good in itself, is not sufficient for this latter purpose, as was demonstrated by the astonishingly high percentage of unfit men among those called up for service during the war.

7. There is a strong prejudice against conscription in peace time for fear of imitating the mistake of our enemy by creating an army whose very size and efficiency would demand its utilization. But it is neither necessary nor desirable that we should form our citizen army on the German model. We should do far better to take the Swiss army as our model—an army which has never been a danger to any of its neighbours, but has sufficed to save its own country more than once from threatened invasion.

NO

1. If we had had a large conscript army before the war Germany would have had some real basis for the contention that she was being encircled by enemies and was forced to fight for her existence. It was just because we had only a small voluntary army that German aggression is left without excuse or palliation.

2. We owe our victory to citizen armies raised rapidly at a time of acute crisis for a special purpose. In the special circumstances conscription was necessary in order to raise a sufficiently large army, but it was an unhappy necessity, which brought much misery and injustice in its train. To continue a war expedient in times of peace would be foolish and dangerously provocative to other nations.

3. The superstition, universally prevalent before the war,

that an army is of little use unless it has been trained through a long course of conscription has been exploded by the war. The British and American armies were just as efficient as any others and yet they were both raised hastily in non-conscription countries.

4. Aerial developments will make it necessary for us to control the air in the same way as we rule the seas. This will place a sufficiently heavy burden on our taxpayers without adding to it the intolerable weight of conscription.

5. Conscription is always felt to be oppressive. Even populations which are used to it groan under it. In Britain the plan would never pass the House of Commons except in time of war.

6. The lamentably high percentage of the unfit revealed by the military examinations during the war is caused alone by our evil social conditions. We cannot expect an A1 population so long as C3 social conditions obtain. Conscription would only make these bad conditions worse by adding one hardship more.

7. The evil of conscription in peace time is best seen in Germany before the war. A large and influential officer class was built up, all vitally interested in war, for their careers depended on it. A nation at peace which allows a class of this kind to flourish in its midst will soon find itself on one excuse or another rushed into war.

REFERENCES :—

- Military History*, by John W. Fortesque (Cambridge Manuals, 1914).
Speeches on Imperial Defence (Simpkin Marshall, 1906); *A Nation in Arms* (John Murray, 1907); and *Fallacies and Facts of Compulsory Service* (John Murray, 1911), by Earl Roberts.
Democracy and Liberty, by W. E. H. Lecky (vol. i.).
Naval Preparedness, speeches by the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill (1918).
 Article on "Conscription," by H. S. Shelton (*Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1916.)

80 HANDBOOK FOR LITERARY SOCIETIES

Two *articles* on "Military Compulsion," by Ellis Griffith (for) and Llewellyn Williams (against) in *Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1916.

The *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution* deals with the subject continually.

IS CONSISTENCY A VICE OR A VIRTUE ?

A VIRTUE

1. A change of mind is nearly always the result of some weakness of character, indicating either a slack grasp of a subject to start with or vacillation of purpose in adhering to a line of conduct.

2. A rolling stone gathers no moss. If a man changes his opinion or his occupation, he does not advance either in thought or towards the truth : he only yields to an irrational impulse.

3. Opinions to be of any value must grow. All summer-saulting is self-deception. The man who is inconsistent shows that he is not growing by a steady development, but is merely losing his way in the world.

4. An inconsistent man is instinctively distrusted by his fellow-men, and there is sound reason at the bottom of this distrust, because if a man cannot remain faithful to one opinion he is not likely to remain faithful to any other.

A VICE

1. To be inconsistent always requires a certain amount of courage, and many men are outwardly consistent in spite of change of inner conviction because they lack the courage to own their mistake.

2. It is only possible to approach the truth through a series of errors. It is impossible to know the truth at once

by intuition, for the truth must be learned painfully. It appears, then, that the consistent man is one who is content to take his own first opinion as the truth, and refuses to believe that it was possible for him to make a mistake. Consistency is often a vice very closely allied to pride of mind.

3. All growth is change. Few men are suddenly inconsistent with their real selves, but many men grow out of an opinion, and when the change appears it seems sudden, though the way was preparing for it a long time before.

4. Many of the greatest men in the world have been inconsistent men at some time in their lives,—philosophers, statesmen, authors.

REFERENCES :—

Winterslow : Essays and Characters, by William Hazlitt (Essay ix).
On Compromise, by John Morley (Macmillan).

Emerson's *Essay on Self-Reliance*.

The God which is Man, by R. Dimsdale Stocker (Francis Griffiths, 1912).

The Conduct of Life, by Lord Haldane (Fisher Unwin, 1907).

Father and Son, by Edmund Gosse (Heinemann, 1913).

A Psychological Study of Religion, by J. H. Leuba (1912).

Conscience and Fanaticism, by G. Pitt-Rivers (Heinemann, 1919).

The Outlook for Religion, by W. E. Orchard (Cassell, 1917).

The Nineteenth Century, vol. i. p. 270. "Mr. Gladstone and Sir George Lewis on Authority," by J. Fitzjames Stephen.

ARE CONVENTUAL AND MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS WORTH PRESERVING ?

YES

1. These societies maintain and try to follow an ideal which, however mistaken it may be in detail, is nevertheless of priceless value to the modern world, which is threatening to abandon all ideals and to collapse into the abyss of a reasoned materialism.

2. "The religious have one motive—the glory of God ; one work—the perfection of their soul as a basis of service ; one rule—the will of God ; one passion—the love of God ; one weapon—prayer."

3. The leading characteristics of the monastic life are worship, peace, strength and happiness. It is possible that if our "big financial interests" could be weighed in the scales of truth against these characteristics that they might turn out to be very "little" things.

4. That very few are suited for this life is admitted, but is this any reason why those who are suited should be prevented from following their vocation. Does modern life develop so many idealists that we can afford to dispense with these ?

5. The commissioners of Henry VIII grossly exaggerated the evils of these societies from interested motives. Thieves are not the best judges of the men whom they despoil,

nor are confessions extorted from terrified monks and nuns very reliable.

6. Professor Harnack says : " It was always the monks who saved the Church when sinking, emancipated her when becoming enslaved to the world, defended her when assailed." The history of these institutions is nearly always written with a strong tendency for or against. It is very difficult therefore for an impartial mind to get at the facts, but an unprejudiced review of the evidence would lead to the conclusion that these societies are well worth preserving. In any case there is no doubt about one important service the monks rendered to humanity—they preserved through the dark ages countless ancient manuscripts which would otherwise have been lost, and they kept scholarship, art and music alive through long periods of violence and decadence.

NO

1. These institutions were useful in the middle ages, but social conditions have so changed that they are now merely ineffectual survivals. " The forms of monasticism remain, but the spirit has gone out of them."

2. Life in these institutions is unnatural and unhealthy. The result is that the inmates, with a few rare exceptions, tend to become morbid and often degenerate.

3. The isolation, confinement and monotonous routine develop a petty and often pitiable spirit. The monastic life is full of little interests, little jealousies and little intrigues.

4. Very few men or women are really suited for this life, yet when once entered upon it is very difficult to abandon, both because the inmate soon becomes unfit for the struggle of life outside, and because of the many obstacles placed in their way by their comrades. These institutions exercise thus a tyranny which no free country should tolerate.

5. These institutions if encouraged tend to become too powerful. At the Reformation it was found necessary to sweep them away altogether, and the time may not be far distant when it may be necessary to have another Reformation in England, if these convents and monasteries are preserved.

6. The history of these "Brotherhoods" and "Sisterhoods" is far from edifying. Even if due allowance is made for exaggerations and misstatements of dogmatic hate and due recognition is accorded to the fact that many genuine saints flourished in these institutions, still the verdict of history is against them—they are not worth preserving.

REFERENCES :—

- English Monastic Life*, by Cardinal Gasquet (Methuen, 1904).
Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St. Swithin's Priory, Winchester, ed. by G. W. Kitchin (describes mediæval monastic life).
Life in a Monastery, by Joseph McCabe (Grant Richards, 1898).
Twelve years in a Monastery, by Joseph McCabe (Watts & Co., 1912).
Revival of the Religious Life, by P. B. Bull (1914).
Truth about a Nunnery, by M. Ayesha (1912).
English Monasteries, by A. H. Thompson (1913).
The Nun, by René Bazin.
The Conventionalists, and other novels, by the late Robert Hugh Benson, deal with monastic life ; also several written by John Ayscough.

SHOULD DIVORCE BE MADE EASIER ?

YES

1. Judicial Separations as provided for by the present law inflict unwarrantable hardship and offer no solution of the trouble they are meant to meet. If a mistake is made in marriage it is no use to separate the parties and forbid them to marry again. By separating them the law admits that they cannot live together, and yet by forbidding remarriage it inflicts a terrible punishment upon them for not doing what the law itself admits is impossible, namely, to live together.

2. These unhappy couples, thus legally separated, form naturally other attachments, but they are not allowed to marry, hence a state of things arises which directly encourages unregularized unions. When concubinage is thus encouraged by law, it is high time for reform.

3. Not only is an immense amount of unhappiness brought about by this absurd state of the law, but the nation suffers, for these separated men and women are officially condemned to sterility, just at a time when we are deploring the fall in the birth-rate. The future condition of the world depends upon the birth-rate, yet we consent to sterilize an enormous number of people, just because they have made a mistake in marriage.

4. The whole case is so obvious that there would be no opposition at all if it were not for the theologians.

Judicial Separations should be turned into divorces after a specified time, say three years. This gives ample opportunity for reconciliation and cannot be construed into an attack upon the sanctity of marriage, except by bigots. The texts brought forward now against this necessary reform are the same as were advanced in 1857, when in spite of them divorce was legalized in England. Would any sane mind be willing to go back to the bad old days when there was no relief at all from the bonds of an unhappy marriage?

5. The people who oppose this reform are extremists who think all divorce is an evil. The fact is that divorce, so far from being evil in itself, is a cure for a much greater evil, namely a life-long unhappiness. We ask now for a further curative measure for the evil of Judicial Separation.

6. The laws laid down by the early Church may have been just and right at the time, but it is monstrous to try to make them binding on us, living two thousand years later under totally different conditions of life. Bigotry is not reason. The path of reform cannot be closed by cobwebs.

NO

1. All laws are curtailments of individual liberty and inflict unavoidable hardship in particular cases. To increase facilities for divorce would not improve matters, but would make them worse. It is only necessary to examine the state of things in America, where divorce has been made easier, to see that restlessness and discontent have only increased.

2. The tendency of couples who are separated is in time to become reconciled. In countries where divorce is easy, it is surprising the frequency with which divorced couples get married again. In some places this has occurred so often as to have become "fashionable." This

shows that in most cases of unhappy marriage, separation leads to a natural reconciliation, and divorce is not necessary.

3. Easy divorce does not increase population, but on the contrary decreases it. This is obvious from the fact that the birth-rate is increasing in the very countries in which divorce is difficult, and is decreasing in the countries where it is easy.

4. The Christian position is perfectly clear : the sanctity of marriage is maintained and that it is indissoluble is insisted upon. All divorce is wrong on Christian principles, though it may be conceded in a few special cases, owing to "the weakness of the flesh." In fact, our present law goes even further than necessary to meet all cases of hardship. If divorce were to be made easier, the flood-gates would be open and the sanctity of marriage, the blessings of home-life, the future of the children, and the morality of the nation would be imperilled.

5. The family should be the unit in the state, and not the individual. This is the only way to solve the increasing difficulties of the modern state, such as the birth-rate, position and work of women, care and education of children, and the like. This end can only be reached by strengthening the marriage bond, which is the very condition of family life. Divorce made easier is simply family life made insecure.

6. It is not any particular laws laid down by the early Church, but the very principles of Christianity which are at stake. Slight adaptations of these principles may be necessary in this age, but the validity of the principles themselves cannot safely be called in question. In short, the ideal is that marriage is indissoluble, and we must try to get as near as possible to it. To move away from this ideal by making divorce easier is disastrous.

REFERENCES :—

- Report of the Royal Commission on Divorce* (King & Son).
History of Divorce, by S. B. Kitchin (Chapman & Hall, 1912).
Marriage and Divorce, by Cecil Chapman, Metropolitan magistrate (David Nutt, 1911).
Marriage in Church and State, by T. A. Lacey (Robert Scott, 1912).
Divorce Problems of To-day (1912, with a useful bibliography) ; and
Divorce as it Might be (1915), by E. S. P. Haynes (Simpkin Marshall).
The Mystery of Marriage, by Prebendary Denison (Robert Scott, 1916).
Divorce and Morality, by C. S. Bremner (Frank Palmer, 1912).
Wedded Life, by Mrs. L. Gell (Mowbray, 1917).
The Question of Divorce, by the Rev. Charles Gore (Murray, 1911).
Getting Married, play, by G. Bernard Shaw.
Just to get Married, and *Marriage as a Trade*, by Cicely Hamilton.
The Divorce Law Reform Union and the Marriage Defence Council publish many pamphlets on the subject.

SHALL WE DISESTABLISH AND DISENDOW THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ?

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF DISESTABLISHMENT

1. Where an intimate union of Church and State exists, "instead of the Church spiritualizing the State, the State secularizes the Church."—*Sir G. C. Lewis.*

2. The national unity of faith which was once expressed by a State Church no longer exists.

3. A State Church cannot exist without religious, social and financial inequality.

4. A Church can never be a free and independent moral force while it is supported by the State. The clergy come to regard themselves as the paid advocates of the Government, and consequently support current abuses, resist reforms, or at best abstain from just criticism.

5. If the State Church were disestablished it would grow immensely and probably absorb Nonconformity.

6. The Established Church is not even the Church of the majority, and its members are relatively diminishing.

7. It is useless to make any attempt at union amongst the different Churches while one of them has an unfair advantage over the others.

8. A State Church from its organization is almost bound to be a political machine. As such it exercises a tyrannical influence over life and thought, especially in rural districts.

9. The machinery of a State Church being very cumbersome, and many conflicting interests being involved, it is very difficult for it to reform itself. It cannot easily revise its tests to keep pace with the progress of knowledge and of religious feeling, and yet it wishes to attract all within its boundaries. Hence it arises that while maintaining tests, it has practically no creed at all, thus directly encouraging hypocrisy.

10. The congregation in a State Church are powerless. They cannot choose and they cannot get rid of their clergymen, unless for some most serious offence.

11. A State Church which has absorbed so much national wealth as the English Establishment is an attraction to indolent place-hunters who wish for a share of the loaves and fishes on easy terms.

12. An Established Church, such as we have in England, is contrary to the spirit and letter of the teaching of Christ. (See Matt. xx. 25-28 ; Luke xiv. 25-27 ; Matt. x. 6-42, and many other similar passages.)

ARGUMENTS FOR DISENDOWMENT

1. The property given to the State Church was meant for the national benefit. It is therefore wrong to devote it mostly to one sect. Most of its endowments were Roman Catholic, and the State appropriated them. The others were given to it while it still had the right to be called the National Protestant Church. A Church should justify its existence by its power of self-support.

2. Tithes were imposed by the State for the support of a national Church, and should revert to the State in case of disestablishment.

3. A more moderate proposal is to give the Church, on disestablishment, a certain number of years' purchase of her revenues.

4. All these difficulties were brought forward on the occasion of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and yet that measure has proved a great success.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST DISESTABLISHMENT

1. A State Church is the guardian of the spiritual interests of the State. The State would inevitably become irreligious, not to say materialistic, without this active representative of religion and morals.

2. It is a great advantage that every person in the land, whatever faith he profess, can demand the spiritual services of the clergy of the State Church.

3. Were the Church to be disestablished and lose her wealth and her dignity, the cause of religion, of morals, and of education would suffer.

4. Other institutions besides the Church would begin to crumble were disestablishment to take place. The Church is the great teacher of order and submission to the properly constituted authorities, and this steadying influence is particularly needed in these days of social utopias and rash reform.

5. The Church, if disestablished, would have to contract her sphere of operations, religious, moral, educational and charitable, and the whole country, especially the poorer communities, would feel the difference.

6. The Church is no longer apathetic, but has renewed its lease of life, and the energy of its clergy is not only rapidly increasing its influence, but is also stopping the progress of dissent.

7. The conflict between the Churches would only be the sharper were all placed upon the same footing.

8. The power, prestige and wealth of the Church have always attracted men of education and culture within it. Such men are often the only civilizing agencies in a parish.

9. The connection between Church and State is a guarantee that no tests impossible to the general sentiment of the country will be imposed upon its members. Thus the religion of a State Church is broad and comprehensive.

10. The Anglican clergy have a fairly independent position, and are not at the mercy of the prejudices and caprices of their congregations.

11. The Established Church, while duly inculcating the faithful performance of professional duty, has been able to encourage learning and scholarship among its clergymen, by placing them beyond the reach of material cares.

12. Christ came to found a Church, and the Established Church can trace its descent right back to the primitive Church, founded by the apostles and their immediate successors. It would be impossible and undesirable for modern clergymen to try to imitate the simplicity of the early apostles.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST DISENDOWMENT

1. All the endowments of the Church of England are its own by clear title. To take them away would be dishonest spoliation.

2. It is the duty of the State to protect the rights of property, and one of its first duties, therefore, is to secure to the State Church its endowments.

3. The property of the Church was not conferred upon her by the State, but by devout individuals ; the State, therefore, can have no possible right to disendow the Church

4. Disendowment would create more difficulties than it would remedy, for there would be a strong objection to public buildings, like cathedrals, being owned by a sect, and there would be stronger objection to paying over to the Church the heavy compensation which would be demanded.

REFERENCES :—

- For Statistics : Martin's *Property and Revenues of the English Church Establishment*.
 Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*,
 Dean Alford's *Essays and Addresses*.
 F. Harrison. *A Practical Way of Disestablishing and Disendowing the Church*, 1878.
 E. Miall. *The Title Deeds of the Church of England to her Parochial Endowments*.
 E. A. Freeman's *Disestablishment and Disendowment* (Macmillan).
 Noel's *Church and State*.
 Richard and Carvell Williams' *Disestablishment* (Imperial Parliament Series).
 J. G. Rogers' *Church Systems* (Hodder & Stoughton).
 Figgis' *Churches in the Modern State* (Longmans, 1913).
The New Horizon of State and Church, by W. H. P. Faunce (Macmillan, 1919).
Welsh Disestablishment, by P. W. Wilson (Hodder & Stoughton, 1912).
The Real Aspect of Disestablishment, by H. Hensley Henson (Skeffington, 1895).
 Articles : (in *The Nineteenth Century*), "The Church of England and State Control," by C. W. Emmet (Feb. 1918) ; "The Church's Self-Government," by the Bishop of Zanzibar (March, 1918) ; "The Denationalisation of the Church of England," by the Bishop of Carlisle (Nov. 1917) ; "Church and State," by the Earl of Selborne (June, 1917).
 "Church and State," by the Rev. J. R. Cohn (*Contemporary Review*, Sept. 1917).

DOES MODERN DRESS NEED REFORM ?

YES

1. The present dress of men is ugly and irrational, not being arranged on any reasonable theory either as regards warmth, modesty or elegance.

2. It affords very small opportunity for variety in taste, and hence tends to reduce all men to one dead level,—one universal monotony of ugliness.

3. There has been a regrettable deterioration in the dress of men, and in consequence a great deal of the brightness, variety, and colour has been taken out of life.

4. Both the athlete and the brain-worker naturally refuse to wear tight-fitting clothes, and the experience of men all tends to show that these tight-fitting clothes are a mistake. We might learn a valuable lesson from the costume of Eastern countries.

5. It is only the fear of being thought eccentric which prevents men from following a more reasonable taste in their dress. If it were not for this fear the wearing of knickerbockers would become almost universal, and the reign of baggy trousers would come to an end, and we should never see the tall hat any more.

6. The dress of women is irrational and inconvenient, and now that they are taking their place in the struggle for existence, they must have some less hampering clothing:

7. Taste and prejudice in dress are admittedly matters

of custom, and if any considerable body of women were to lead the way, there would soon arise a taste or prejudice in favour of rational dress for women.

NO

1. Any change is now practically impossible. We are so much under the dominion of the present style of dress, and it is so universally adopted that it has become a badge of civilization, and cannot be altered. Even heathen nations as they become civilized begin to throw aside their picturesque costumes to adopt ours.

2. It is not the dress that has affected the taste, but the taste the dress. It is because we have so little variety in our taste that our dress is so uniform, and this general uniformity is a phenomenon that civilization always tends to produce.

3. Any recurrence to a former and more picturesque style is impossible on the score of expense alone. The days when men would spend as much as £20 on a single shirt are happily over, and it is not probable that men will ever again be hampered by a cumbrous frill around their necks.

4. The dress of man is steadily becoming easier, and the chief thing that prevents more rapid progress is the extremes to which faddists and reformers usually go.

5. As it is, men's dress is very well adapted to their life. The only faults which can be found with it are the stiff collars and hats, and the sad uniformity of the black colour.

6. The present dress of women is the result of a long development, and cannot be set aside at the bidding of a few faddists. Modern women's clothing may be somewhat hampering, but not to any serious extent, while it has reached a wonderful degree of beauty and elegance.

7. Great efforts have been made to introduce dress reform, but without success ; the extremists who advocate it are usually regarded with a wholesome dislike.

REFERENCES :—

- History of English Dress*, by Georgiana Hill (Bentley, 1893).
The Heritage of Dress, by Wilfrid Mark Webb (Grant Richards, 1907).
British Costume during Nineteen Centuries, by Mrs. Ashdown (Jack, 1910).
Chats on Costume, by G. W. Rhead (Fisher Unwin, 1906).
English Costume, by Dion Clayton Calthrop (Black, 1906).
Modes and Manners of the Nineteenth Century (Dent, 1909).
History of British Costume, by J. R. Planché (Bohn, 1907).
Colour in Dress, by G. A. Audsley (Sampson Low, 1912).
 Various Catalogues, etc., issued by the Department of Textiles, at the Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington.
 Articles : " Tyranny of Fashion in War-time," by M. H. Mason (*Nineteenth Century*, March, 1917). " Working Clothes " (*The Englishwoman*, Oct. 1917).

SHOULD THE DRINK TRAFFIC BE NATIONALIZED ?

YES

1. Under present conditions there is so powerful and wealthy a class in the country vitally interested in the maintenance of the drink traffic that all efforts at radical reform are frustrated: if, however, the Government took over the whole traffic into its own hands, then reforms would be much more easily introduced, because private interest would not conflict with public duty.

2. In Government hands all profits resulting would be devoted to the national welfare, and thus some modicum of good would be extracted from the evil.

3. The competition at present existing in the drink trade has driven the producers to extensive adulteration. Under Government control this adulteration would cease:

4. There would be no more injustice in the Government allowing no competition in its control of the liquor traffic than there is in its allowing no competition in the carrying of the mails.

5. The conditions of those employed in breweries and in bars would be greatly improved if the traffic were under Government management.

NO

1. Now it is only the interest of a comparatively small

class of the community to maintain the drink traffic ; but if this traffic were nationalized, then the whole nation would have a financial interest in keeping it up, and reform would be out of the question.

2. If this scheme were carried out the whole nation would be put in the position of hypocrites, for they would take over the drink traffic nominally for the sake of reform, and yet the only result would be that they would make a handsome profit out of it.

3. Competition has the effect of making public services more efficient. There is just as likely to be adulteration under the official control of Government as there is under private trade. Efforts to restrain the efficient service of one of the staples of life manifestly emanate from a blind fanaticism which sees only one half round a subject.

4. So many vested interests have gown around this traffic that it would be a glaring injustice to nationalize the industry without adequate compensation, and if adequate compensation were given, the expense would be ruinous to the country. There is no analogy in the Post Office, because this has been managed by Government practically from the beginning.

5. Private companies treat their servants well, as it is plainly in their interest to do, and these would not be better off under Government control.

REFERENCES :—

- The Drink Question*, by Kate Mitchell ; esp. chap. i. (Sonnenschein).
Democracy and Liberty, by W. E. H. Lecky, 1896, vol. ii. chap. vii. pp. 112-139.
Popular Control of the Liquor Traffic, by Dr. E. R. L. Gould ; with Introduction by J. Chamberlain (Cassell & Co., 1894, 1s.) (Full of facts—index).
Sober by Act of Parliament, by F. A. McKenzie (Sonnenschein, 1894).
The Philosophy of Conflict, by Havelock Ellis (Constable, 1919)
The Progress of Eugenics, by C. W. Saleeby (Cassell, 1914).
 Consult all references given for Debate on " Local Option."

100 HANDBOOK FOR LITERARY SOCIETIES

Articles : By H. G. Chancellor (against State Purchase) and by J. E. C. Welldon (in favour) in *Contemporary Review*, July, 1918. "The Churches and the Future of Temperance Reform," by the Bishop of Croydon ; and a Reply by Sir Thomas Whittaker, in the *Contemporary Review*, Aug. 1918. Two articles on "State Purchase of the Liquor Trade," by Bishop Hamilton Baynes and H. G. Chancellor (*Contemporary Review*, July, 1917).

TAXATION OF LAND VALUES AND THE SINGLE TAX

FOR

1. The right to occupy land is on the same footing as the right to live. It is a natural right. The land, for this reason, and also because it must originally have done so, belongs to all the people of a country. It is nobody's business, therefore, to interfere with their enjoyment of it by fixing and exacting rents.

2. It is true that the predecessors of modern landlords had the *power* to convey and bequeath the land, but this is not the same thing as the *right* to do so. You cannot acquire a right to do a wrong. Herbert Spencer asks : " At what rate per annum does wrong become right ? "

3. Land is essentially on a different footing from other property, since it is limited in quantity, and yet the use of it, directly or indirectly, is necessary for every human enterprise. It is idle to argue that land is always for sale. It is not always for sale where it is wanted ; and if it is so to be had, the price is probably exorbitant.

4. The suggestion of purchase and compensation ignores the whole principle of the argument, which is that the whole people own all the land. (The peasant proprietor is as much to be condemned as the greatest landowner.) To restore this ownership it is only necessary to impose a tax up to the full rental value, and not to interfere in any

way with possession. This course would result in immense benefit to the whole community, since all other taxes might be forthwith remitted.

AGAINST

1. Acquisition of ownership by long occupation is everywhere admitted as both legally and morally right. Henry George himself says : " There is no middle course. Either the land belongs to the people or to the landlord ; " and therefore, on the above admitted principle, the rights of ownership are indisputable. Everything comes in the first instance from the land and to carry this argument to its logical conclusion would be to deny the right of ownership in personal property as well.

2. As far back as the feudal times the notion that land was the common property of all had disappeared, and though ownership was in a sense unknown, since holders were only lessees, still they held not from the nation, but from the crown.

3. Property in land is nevertheless property, and to single out one form of property for taxation is unjust upon any ground. Properly safeguarded expropriation laws, providing full compensation, would meet any real difficulties arising from the scarcity of land.

4. The single tax is a delusion, and there is no proof that it would accomplish what is promised for it. Even supposing that it did so, and all other taxes were abolished, it is more than doubtful if the people would benefit. The argument that other taxes had no longer to be paid would be used to lower wages.

REFERENCES :—

Land and People, and *Progress and Poverty*, by Henry George.
The Lords, the Land, and the People, by D. Lloyd-George (Hodder & Stoughton, 1910).

- Ownership, Tenure, and the Taxation of Land*, by Sir Thos. Whitaker (Macmillan).
- Land Nationalization*, by Alfred Russell Wallace (Sonnenschein, 1902).
- The Great State*: a symposium: section on "The Country Side" (Harper, 1912).
- The Case for Land Nationalization*, by J. Hyder (Simpkin Marshall, 1913).
- Land and Labour*, by B. Seeböhm Rowntree (Macmillan, 1911).
- The Future of Work* (chaps. iv. and xii.), by L. Chiozza Money (Fisher Unwin, 1914).
- Economics*, by Henry Clay (Macmillan, 1916).
- An Alphabet of Economics*, by A. R. Orage (Fisher Unwin, 1917).
- Article: "Henry George and Private Property," by J. A. Ryan (*The Catholic World*, June, 1911).

SHOULD PARLIAMENT LIMIT THE HOURS OF THE WORKING DAY ?

YES

1. The hours of work are now so excessively long that the physical condition of the whole working classes is steadily declining. "Men and women who get up to go to work before daylight and return from that work after dark, cannot find life worth living."—*Lord Leverhulme*.

2. The factory system and the excessive subdivision of labour have made the labour of the working classes so monotonous that unless some means is taken to secure to them adequate leisure they become brutalized, and the intelligence of the class degenerates. "Trust labour wholeheartedly and wisely, and all will be well." The British spirit responds when trusted, but only becomes morose under suspicion.

3. This lack of intelligence becomes a serious matter in view of the fact that more and more political power is passing into the hands of the working classes : if this power is not use intelligently by them, the result must be social disaster.

4. The hours of labour are so long that the working classes know practically nothing of family life, and the natural result is a moral decline : when the life of working men becomes hard and hopeless, it is only to be expected

that they will take to drink. The over-fatigue of the workers is the greatest waste of time.

5. Higher wages can only be paid if the output is increased. When long hours are worked the "ca' canny" system usually creeps in. This evil principle, so long discarded in the U.S.A., is one of the severest blights upon our industry. When the hours of labour are reduced, it is found that the work is done in quite a different spirit, with the result that output increases and with the output come increased wages. The theories of some political economists have led them to expect a decrease of wages and a failing market from shorter hours, but facts all testify against them.

6. When competition is left to itself the evils of over-production, the unemployed, commercial crises and panics result,—the short-hour system supplies a remedy, and is generally acknowledged by an ever-increasing number of economists to be an economic necessity.

7. The general contentions of those in favour of reducing the hours of the working day are proved by the great fact that British commerce has increased by leaps and bounds since the introduction of restrictions upon labour such as the Factory Acts and the like. Woeful predictions were made when these Acts were passed, yet the result has been for the good of the community.

8. No one who is familiar with the sterling worth of many of our working men—our Northumberland miners or the weavers of Yorkshire and Lancashire—will contend that the effect of shorter hours can be anything but favourable. In any case workmen cannot be taught to use leisure rightly as long as they have no leisure to use. What we should strive for is a real adult education and this can only be made possible by shorter hours.

9. If the law does not step in and secure this reform, then the men themselves will obtain it by means of

combinations and strikes, which are disastrous to the community.

10. If it is asked, Why should a man be prevented from working as long as he likes? the answer is that no one wishes to prevent him, so long as his action does not compel others to work longer than they like. Modern industrial legislation is not tyranny, but the will of the people taking effect to prevent the tyranny of individual selfishness.

NO

1. A limitation in the hours of the working day would produce worse evils than those it pretends to cure. There would be a loss of liberty both on the part of employers and employed, for which even a better physical condition would be no compensation.

2. A decrease in the hours of labour can only mean a fall in the amount of wages and a decrease of the output of factories, with a consequent further stagnation of trade.

3. Sentimental arguments cannot be allowed to weigh against the fact that if we reduce the hours of labour by Act of Parliament, then we should be in an unfavourable condition compared to those nations who would not follow our example.

4. The growing power of the working classes is a grave political danger, and if more leisure were given them, then their mischievous political influence would only be increased, and society would be convulsed by socialistic agitation.

5. If the working classes had more leisure they would drink the more; often the only thing that now saves them is the necessity for hard work.

6. Competition has produced our present commercial supremacy, and the condition of our further progress is

the unfettered working of this same individual competition. All grandmotherly legislation only stands in the way of progress.

7. The prevention of some of the worst forms of factory tyranny was a good thing, but that does not mean that we should push matters to an extreme, and reduce the hours of the working day. Taken at its best, this proposal is wholly inadequate as a reform, for socialists see that it is only part of a larger movement, and by itself cannot meet the evils of the social condition of the masses. It is plain, therefore, that this movement is only the thin end of the wedge, and should be resisted by all who are dismayed at the prospect of an imminent socialism.

8. "We must remember the prevalent fallacy that the limitation of labour raises its price, and transfers some of the master's profits to the workman's pockets. To lessen the day's labour by one hour is to lessen the supply of labour by one-ninth or one-tenth part, and to the same extent to waste the efficiency of all machinery, and of the fixed capital connected therewith." (Jevons' *The State in Relation to Labour*, pp. 65-66.)

9. It is a good rule that the law should not help those who can help themselves. The Factory Acts in relation to women and children were good, because they are physically inferior and unable to protect themselves, but any interference by Parliament in the hours of adult male labour is unnecessary and even dangerous as a precedent.

10. Any enterprising and capable man in any line of life raises the standard for the rest, and has influence in making the work of his class harder; but for this reason are we to put a check upon enterprise and hard work? This agitation is a specimen of much similar agitation which has for its object the reducing of the capable and willing men to the level of the incapable and the idle.

REFERENCES:—

The Six Hour Day, by Lord Leverhulme (Allen & Unwin, 1919).
The Human Machine and Industrial Efficiency, by Fred S. Lee
 (Longmans, 1919).

An Alphabet of Economics, by A. R. Orage (Fisher Unwin, 1917).

The Future of Work, by Leo Chiozza Money (Fisher Unwin, 1914).

The Way to Industrial Peace, chap. iii., by B. Seebohm Rowntree
 (Fisher Unwin, 1914).

Problems of Industry (chap. v., Regulation of the Hours of Labour);
 and *Industrial Democracy* (chap. vi.), by S. and B. Webb
 (Longmans, 1902).

Life and Labour in London (vol. v. Part 2), by Charles Booth (Mac-
 millan, 1903).

Articles: "The Shorter Working Day," by Page Arnott (*Women's
 Industrial News*, Oct. 1916). "Industrial Fatigue," by C.
 K. Ogden (*Nineteenth Century*, Feb. 1917). "Industrial
 Fatigue," by Lord Henry Bentinck (*Contemporary Review*,
 Feb. 1918). "Mothers in Factories," by Ernestine Mills
 (*Englishwoman*, Jan. 1919).

DOES THE MODERN STATE NEED A FIGUREHEAD

NO

1. Kingship is one of the oldest institutions in the world. As long as Kings were chosen for personal valour or elected for personal merit, there was a very important function for them to fulfil; but now through the mistakes and cruelties of tyrants in the past the functions of the King have become so restricted that he is little more than a national figurehead, and it is not worth a modern nation's while to maintain so costly an ornament.

2. To avoid the danger of rival claimants for the crown and civil war, it has been found necessary to make the high office hereditary. The consequence is that in most royal houses degeneracy sets in, and the figurehead ceases to be even an ornament.

3. Among the masses of the people there is a slumbering jealousy of the royal prerogative. Under the reign of a good king this hardly finds any expression at all, but as the office is hereditary there is no guarantee that future kings will be good kings. The very existence then of the office brings with it the possibility of serious social unrest so soon as the occupant of the throne is not a worthy one.

4. Government for the people and by the people is becoming more and more a fact in modern democratic nations

and kingship is undoubtedly an anachronism, a survival, the real purpose of which has long faded away.

5. The United States of America and France show that kings are not at all necessary to the well-being of modern states. A king has no place in a republic and a limited monarchy is merely a republican form of government in which an artificial place for a king has been devised by making the constitution needlessly complicated.

YES

1. Though the powers of the King are somewhat vague, they are generally understood to be three :—the right to be consulted, the right to encourage and the right to warn. These three powers are very important, because no minister can neglect the King's influence in view of his exalted station.

2. Ministers come and go, but there is no resignation for the King ; thus it often happens that the King has extensive experience in the practical working of the government of the country, which makes his advice extremely valuable. He is far from being a mere figurehead, but on the contrary is in a position to exercise one of the most important functions in the national life.

3. Queen Victoria brought about a great change in the attitude of the people to the Crown. Edward VII was perhaps the most popular sovereign we ever had and George V has rallied the entire nation round him by his self-effacing labours during the war. The Crown is now the real bond of union for the Empire.

4. The King is the head of Society and as such his influence is dominant. Where the Royal Family set a high and good example the effect is very beneficial. The King is expected to patronize with judgment art, literature, science and the stage. He is the head of great movements for the

improvement of the lot of the people. At present anyway the King's people are all for the people's King.

5. Both in France and in the U.S.A. it is often felt to be a great weakness that there is no permanent national representative. The King often has had the most happy influence on our foreign relations. When Edward VII came to the throne we were very coldly regarded in most of the countries of Europe on account of the South African war. He made a series of visits and the whole situation changed. The entente with France was restored. All arrangements were of course carried out by the ministers, but the courtesies of the King paved the way. A limited monarchy prevents the kingly power from being abused, and yet gives full scope for its proper and beneficent exercise.

REFERENCES :—

- On Heroes* (Lecture vi. : the Hero as King), by Thomas Carlyle.
The Prince, by Niccolo Machiavelli (trans. in Dent's Everyman's Library).
Treatise on Civil Government, by John Locke : chaps. xiv., xviii. and xix.
Contrat Social, by J. J. Rousseau (trans. in Dent's Everyman's Library).
The Governance of England (chaps. xiv. and xv.), by Sidney Low (Fisher Unwin, 1914).
The Government of England (Part I., The Crown), by A. L. Lowell (Macmillan, 1912).
The Growth and Decline of the French Monarchy, by J. McKinnon (Longmans, 1902).
The Divine Right of Kings, by J. N. Figgis (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1914).
The Coming of Parliament, by L. C. Jane (Story of the Nations Series, 1905).
Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty : a symposium (Oxford Univ. Press, 1917).
War and the Future (Part I.), by H. G. Wells (Cassell, 1917).
In the Fourth Year (chap. vii.), by H. G. Wells (Chatto & Windus, 1918).
Anymoon, by Horace Bleackley (Lane, 1919).

OUGHT COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS TO BE ABOLISHED ?

NO

1. Under the competitive system the best man gets the prize, or the post, while every man has an equal chance ; thus all the abuses of nepotism are done away with.

2. It is the only practical means of testing results both as regards the teaching and the learning.

3. Competition is the life of all trades and professions, and the survival of the fittest is the law of the world. There is as much need for this stimulus in school as in business.

4. Free competition is the only means by which an obscure man can rise.

5. If the examination is conducted with care, the examiners can make sure they are getting the man with the particular qualification they require, and this is very desirable in the case of Government service.

6. By experience it is found that those do best in competitive examinations who do not overwork, so the effect cannot really be described as unhealthy.

YES

1. Experience proves that it is not the best educated, but the best " crammed " man who succeeds in competitive examinations.

2. Some system of probation would be preferable, and much more certain and satisfactory in its results.

3. The competitive examination system trains only the intellectual powers, and not the physical or moral. Examinations are but poor tests of judgment, discretion, temper, trustworthiness, self-control and sagacity ; yet these are better things than mere learning.

4. Many of the best minds mature slowly, and examinations fail to make room for these men.

5. It is always found in experience that these examinations have a strong tendency to overstrain the competitors, and permanently to injure their health and usefulness.

6. A striking number of the men who have done great deeds, mental, moral and physical, were notoriously feeble in examinations, which are merely tests of how much the mind can retain ; not at all of what it can produce.

REFERENCES :—

- Methods of Social Reform*, by W. S. Jevons (Macmillan).
Thoughts on Government, No. vii., by Sir Arthur Helps.
Short Studies, by J. A. Froude (Longmans).
Education, by Herbert Spencer.
The Public Schools and the Empire, chap. iv., by H. B. Gray (Williams and Norgate, 1913).
Mutual Aid, by Prince Kropotkin, chap. ii. (Heinemann 1915).
What is Coming ? chap. vii. (1916) ; and *Joan and Peter* (1918), by H. G. Wells (Cassell).
A Dominie's Log (1916) ; and *A Dominie Dismissed* (1917), by A. S. Neill (Herbert Jenkins).
What is and what might be, by Edmond Holmes (Constable, 1917).
Public Schools and Public Needs, by G. G. Coulton (Simpkin Marshall, 1901).

SHOULD THE HOUSE OF LORDS BE REFORMED ?

NO

1. The House of Lords was not made : it grew as a useful check on the democratic, law-making Commons. Though the position is undoubtedly full of anomalies, as a matter of fact the influence of this second chamber is salutary on the whole and should not be interfered with.

2. "The House of Lords has the influence which belongs to wealth, to high rank and ancient lineage, to landed property, to ideas and sentiments, which have been interwoven into the texture of English society, and to traditions, and usages, and habits of mind, which are the growth of ages."—*Sidney Low*.

3. A popular assembly is apt to be carried away by emotions, or by spasms of zeal, constructive or destructive, and the House of Lords applies a useful, restraining hand.

4. The House of Lords secures further time for reflection before proposed legislation becomes actual law. In 1893 when the Commons passed the Home Rule Bill and the Lords threw it out, they were right, because the question had not been properly tested in the election. On that occasion at least the Lords saved the country from a grave mistake.

5. "In the domain of private legislation the work done by the House of Lords is of extreme importance." Private

bills are in their initial stages divided between the two Houses. The Committees of the Lords compare very favourably with those of the Commons, and command the respect of the business community. The burden of these private bills is on the increase and could not be transacted if left to the Commons alone.

6. A question is often not thoroughly debated in the Commons on account of the tremendous pressure of business, but in the Lords the procedure is more elastic and points of view emerge which had been unconsidered in the Commons. On the whole, therefore, it would be a great mistake to tamper with a time-honoured institution whose practical usefulness has been so fully demonstrated.

YES

1. The House of Lords is an obsolete relic of the past. In a democracy legislation is so slow and often so far behind the enlightened thought of the day that it is intolerable that it should be further delayed and hampered by the Lords.

2. The House of Lords by the very nature of its composition is reactionary. It voices the opinions of one class only—the aristocracy. The British nation is, however, a democracy. It is intolerable, therefore, that a democracy should have its legislation thrown out at the caprice of wealth, rank and privilege.

3. The only real safeguard against hasty legislation is the opposition in the Commons and the possibility of an alternative government. The Lords cannot prevent reform or even revolution if the electorate is really in earnest and the ministry determined to carry out its wishes.

4. This one instance of the Lords' effective action in throwing out the Home Rule Bill of 1893 is not sufficient to justify the institution. This bill would probably never

have passed the Commons if the Opposition had not been able to rely on the Lords throwing it out.

5. That the machinery for dealing with private bills in the Commons is insufficient is no argument for the preservation of the House of Lords. The Commons want reform and want it badly. The whole machinery of Government is too slow for the needs of the Empire and one of the first steps towards hopeful reform is either to end or to mend the House of Lords.

6. The House of Lords is a Conservative body. While a Conservative Government is in power it remain quiescent, but so soon as a Liberal Government is returned, then the Lords become obstructive. This one-sided veto is tyrannous and unendurable. At present a dissolute and disgraceful peer may vote on questions of national importance in an irresponsible and occasional manner. Brains and character are not the natural endowments of rank and birth, nor is political insight a necessary or even a frequent accompaniment of privilege.

REFERENCES :—

- Report of the Select Committee on the House of Lords*, 1908.
The Governance of England (chaps. xii. and xiii.), by Sidney Low (Fisher Unwin, 1914).
The Government of England (chaps. xxi. and xxii.), by A. L. Lowell (Macmillan, 1912).
English Traits (chap. xi., The Aristocracy), by R. W. Emerson.
Second Chambers, by J. A. R. Marriott (Oxford Univ. Press, 1910).
A Defence of Aristocracy, by A. M. Ludovici (Constable, 1915).
The Decline of Aristocracy, by Arthur Ponsonby (Fisher Unwin, 1912).
The Personal Story of the Upper House, by Kosmo Wilkinson (Fisher Unwin, 1905).
Second Chambers in Practice: a symposium (King & Son, 1911).
Essays and Lectures (No. xii., The House of Lords), by H. and M. G. Fawcett (Macmillan, 1872).
Peers and Bureaucrats, by Prof. J. Ramsey Muir (Constable, 1910).
Towards Industrial Freedom (chap. viii., The British Aristocracy and the House of Lords), by Edward Carpenter (Allen & Unwin, 1917).

The Reform of the House of Lords, by W. S. McKechnie (McLehose, 1909).

Peers or People, by W. T. Stead (Fisher Unwin, 1907).

Articles : "The House of Lords and a Model Parliament" (*English Historical Review*) ; and "Recent Peerage Cases" (*Quarterly Review*), by J. H. Round (July, 1915). "Two Chambers or One?" (*Quarterly Review*, July, 1910). "The Requisite Second Chamber," by Aneurin Williams (*Contemporary Review*, Nov. 1917). "A Tame House of Lords," by Lord Sumner (*Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1918). "The Present Need of an Aristocracy," by R. A. Cram (*Hibbert Journal*, April, 1919).

DOUGHT OUR EMPIRE TO FEDERATE ?

YES

1. The colonies have at present no power to modify or participate in the foreign policy which may involve them in war.

2. The present condition of things is inconsistent. We have given them (at least, some of them) internal self-government, and with it great responsibilities ; yet their fate may be in the hands of the voters of the United Kingdom, ignorant of their needs and conditions.

3. The colonies demand fuller power in matters vitally affecting them. They will never be listened to till they are more of an integral part of the Empire.

4. Though colonial interests are enormously important, they have no direct representation in the Imperial System.

5. The one-sided federation existing at present, if not developed to completeness, will lead to discontent and disintegration.

6. In view of the inestimable services rendered by our colonies during the war, we should do our best to prevent them having any cause for dissatisfaction.

7. The colonies should bear part of the expense of protecting the Imperial interests. This can only be demanded when Imperial Federation has been secured.

8. Federation is the only means of placing our Empire on a really permanent and substantial basis.

9. We are fed from abroad, and within the area of the

Empire all that is needed for the sustenance of life is to be found. Therefore a close Federation would bring about a very useful commercial union.

10. Such a vast consolidation of power as the Federated British Empire would mean peace for all mankind.

11. It would be the realization of a noble dream of brotherhood among all the different races who own the sway of Britain.

12. The advocates of progress, peace, self-government and equal rights for all subjects of the realm see that Imperial Federation means the development of commerce, a solid basis of peace, extension of self-government, and the abolition of unjust disqualifications.

13. The prosperity attending the Roman system of colonization is a case in point, and this relation of the colonies to the mother city was only spoiled by the vice of slavery.

14. The severance of the connection between England and the U.S.A. has been a great evil to both countries, and has prevented that freedom of intercourse and trade which would have otherwise existed.

15. Union is strength, and if the bonds uniting England and her colonies be not maintained, then any hostile power might fall upon and reduce the colonies severally, and then, with consolidated power, ruin the mother country.

16. The instance of the want of initiative in Canada does not apply because the real cause of stagnation there has been the dominion of the priesthood, and not dependence on the mother country, and there is every sign at present that Canada has entered upon a career of progress, by developing her vast natural resources.

NO

1. It is impossible to talk of the colonies as if they were homogeneous, but those of them which are self-governed

say they want no further responsibilities. They are in danger of attack at present in any great war, and they would have to defend themselves. Closer federation would mean certain implication in many quarrels with which they have nothing to do.

2. The free self-governing colonies would prefer to work out for themselves schemes for securing additional power in those directions where they are now inconveniently fettered.

3. The present loyalty of such colonies as Canada and Australia is owing to the fact that there is no strong pressure of union felt. This loose union, founded on sentiment and affection, and never too obvious, suits their temper and satisfies them. Were the bonds to be tightened, they would become restive, and would break loose altogether.

4. The funds of the colonies are required for the development of their own resources.

5. Colonies will never pay taxes to be expended beyond their own borders.

6. The scheme is an impossible one. No federation, however close, could ever make a unit of such a heterogeneous mass of different races, religions, opinions, interests, ideals, and stages of civilization.

7. The true colonial policy is to help the colonies to help themselves, not to keep them in leading strings longer than is necessary ; to claim respect rather than obedience from them when they have reached their majority, and to make the tie of relationship as light as possible.

8. The scheme, so far as it is a serious one, is purely commercial. On the part of many of its advocates it is an ingenious attempt to overthrow Free Trade by the establishment of a strong commercial union between Britain and her colonies.

9. It panders to the British love of power and domination. Jingoism has already been a source of danger to the world's peace, and the close federation of the British colonies for defensive purposes, or from motives of Imperial pride, would not be a step towards the "Federation of the World."

10, 11, 12. Past experience should teach us that the idea is merely Utopian, and the only practical result of pressing it must be the irritation and even the alienation of the colonies.

13. Permanent connection with the mother country tends to retard the development of a colony by depriving it of the invigorating feeling of independence and self-reliance. The Greek plan of independent colonies met with much better success, *e.g.* the Ionian settlements, Miletus, Lycia, and Ægina. (See also the effects of Phœnician colonization in Hippo, Utica, and Carthage.) The case of Rome shows that the direct result of her system was the tyranny of an odious oligarchy over a half-subdued barbarism. This tyranny was thought to be permanent, but the forces of Nature broke it.

14. In the case of the U.S.A. the desire to make the bond of union extend to the matter of taxes produced a revolution. Had England not been so bent on maintaining a mischievous control, the two countries would not have been estranged. The want of initiative of Canada, contrasted with the enterprise of the U.S.A., shows how much better it is that the connection should not be permanent.

15. We find that the close connection between colonies and mother country entails the whole (or nearly so) of the Imperial defence upon the mother country, and in the case of war, the necessity of defending the colonies would greatly hamper the mother country.

16. The colonies of Spain in South America have re-

volted ; also see the case of the colonies of Holland and France in Canada and in India, also colonies of Genoa, Venice, and Portugal.

REFERENCES :—

- The Empire and the Future* : a symposium (Macmillan, 1916).
The Heart of the Empire : a symposium, chap. viii. "Imperialism," by G. P. Gooch (Fisher Unwin, 1901).
The Problem of the Commonwealth : a symposium (Macmillan, 1916).
Democracy at the Crossways, by F. J. C. Hernshaw (Macmillan, 1918).
The Empire and Democracy, by G. S. Veitch (Jack's Peoples' Books).
The American Commonwealth, by Lord Bryce (Macmillan, 1910).
Eclipse or Empire? by H. B. Gray and Samuel Turner.
The Path of Empire, by Henry Page Croft (Murray).
Ancient and Modern Imperialism, speeches by Lord Cromer (Murray, 1910).
Messrs. J. M. Dent & Sons publish a series called *Imperial Studies*, edited by Arthur P. Newton.
The Nineteenth Century published a group of articles on "Federalism" in May, 1915, Jan., Aug. and Sept., 1917, and June, 1918.

ARE THE LANDED GENTRY WORTH PRESERVING ?

YES

1. The tendency is for the land to pass into the hands of a few wealthy proprietors, and this tendency is good, for the occupiers of land are always better off under a large proprietor than under a small one, because a smaller proportion of the income has to go to the maintenance of a household, and is available for the improvement of the estate. A large proprietor is much more likely to take a real family interest in the estate.

2. We cannot get on without a strong band of men thoroughly patriotic, because they have much to lose, with time, energy and will to interest themselves in the affairs of the nation, and we find this class in the landed gentry. We see what misery France is suffering for want of this class, and how Spain has degenerated along with her ancient families—the Mendozas, Toledos, etc.

3. If we look back upon our own history, we see that many of our finest citizens have been among the landed gentry.

4. Respect for the past and reverence for forefathers was a conspicuous Roman virtue, and one which largely contributed to the stability of their empire : it is a virtue we should do well to cultivate.

5. Members of this class have often headed the party of progress.

6. If it were not for the landed gentry, socialism would make such rapid progress that revolutionary measures would be passed before the mind of the nation was ready, with the inevitable result of loss of stability to the Government and even of anarchy.

7. Education and general reform theories are carried to extremes by modern faddists, and it is well that there should be a class in the country to hold these enthusiasts in check.

NO

1. The landlord is often a direct oppressor : the more money he has, the more he wants, and he lives to squeeze his tenants.

2. The argument from France and Spain does not apply, nor the argument from our own past, for in those old times the landed gentry used to live upon the land, but now they congregate in cities, and thus, having no real root in the country, must wither.

3. As a rule the landed gentry do not realize their responsibility to the people under their control, and wealth and ease degenerate them into mere pleasure-seekers.

4. That our politicians should be mainly recruited from the landed gentry is an evil, for they are thus able to make the law to suit themselves, and there is little chance for the poor, as litigation is so expensive that justice has become a luxury.

5. These were exceptions, and do not show that there is any real sympathy between the landed gentry as a body and the party of progress.

6. The landed gentry keep up in the English mind the slow-dying precedents of the Feudal System, and they hinder the progress of the democratic ideal towards which the heart of the nation is so uneasily struggling. The landed gentry stand for the inequality of men—that prin-

ciple which holds the great mass of the people in the hopeless bondage of a caste system, and elevates a few by virtue of the accident of their birth to a privileged position.

7. The landed gentry have been the great opponents of the education of the people, and with the Church have striven to keep the people "in that sphere of life in which God has placed them," which is merely a convenient excuse for exploiting their labour.

REFERENCES :—

- Short Studies in Great Subjects*, by J. A. Froude, vol., iii. p. 389 (Longmans).
- The Theory of the State*, by J. K. Bluntschli (trans. 2nd ed., 1892), Book II., chaps. viii., x., xi., xii., xiii.; also Book VI., chaps. xvii., xviii., xix. (Clarendon Press).
- Political Science*, by T. D. Woolsey. Part 3, chap. iv. (On aristocracy in general.)
- Civilization and Progress*, by John Beattie Crozier. 3rd ed. (1892), Part V., chaps. i. and ii. (these are interesting chapters full of fresh thought) (Longmans).
- Westminster Review*, vol. cxlvi., p. 216 (1896). "The Influence of an Aristocracy upon the Stability of a Nation."
- Emerson's *English Traits*, chap. xi. "The Aristocracy."
- The Way of Peace*, by H. Fielding Hall (Hurst & Blacket, 1917).
- The Great State*: a symposium (Harper, 1912); section on "The Country-side."
- A Defence of Aristocracy*, by A. M. Ludovici (Constable, 1915).
- Novels by John Galsworthy: *The Country House* (1911); *The Man of Property* (1906); *The Freelanders* (1915) (Heinemann).
- Play: *The Son and Heir*, by Gladys Vuger (French).
- Article: "The Present Need of an Aristocracy," by R. A. Cram (*Hibbert Journal*, April, 1919).

ARE PHANTASMS OF THE DEAD REAL OR IMAGINARY ?

REAL

1. All over the world to-day, in Europe, Asia, Africa and North and South America there are countless believers in the realities of these phantasms. This belief too can be traced back to the dawn of history : it appears in ancient Egypt, India, Persia and Babylonia. Among ancient Hebrews, Greeks and Romans the same belief prevailed. In spite of all the savage persecutions of the Middle Ages this deep-rooted conviction survived. In all these innumerable cases of alleged phantom appearances we find a striking resemblance to the phenomena of the modern seance. Where a belief is so universal both as regards space and time, we are driven to the conclusion that there must be objective phenomena to account for it and to sustain it.

2. The very large number of cases of phantom appearances collected by the painstaking labour of the Psychical Research Society, although often not quite convincing individually, are in the mass overwhelming. To dismiss all these cases as explainable by hallucination or nervous derangement strains the credulity of the impartial mind far more than to accept the plain conclusion that in many cases at least a "real" phantom was seen.

3. Our senses are limited in their perceptivity, *e.g.* we know that there are sounds we cannot hear and light we

cannot see (beyond the red and beyond the violet rays). Why then should there be any difficulty in believing that real beings may exist though for the most part invisible to us—and if they exist, is it not natural to suppose, in view of the facts, that they sometimes find conditions so favourable that they are able to make themselves visible, at least partially?

4. The phenomena of “materialization” occur so often in modern séance rooms, where every possibility of fraud has been carefully eliminated, that to deny them has now become tantamount to shutting one’s eyes wilfully to the facts of the case.

5. When the keen intelligence and high character of the men who are seriously pursuing this inquiry are duly considered, is it more likely that they are all studiously engaged in deceiving themselves, or that their opponents who simply refuse to investigate the facts, are unscientific dogmatists?

6. As long as these phantoms were supposed to be “supernatural” there was a case for those who refused even to consider the subject: but this view has completely passed away now. We see that these phantoms, though appearing and disappearing in a way unknown to us, are nevertheless obeying fixed laws of nature, which we do not fully grasp, but of which we are beginning to get some rational idea. Superstitious fear is being rapidly banished from this question and scientific inquiry is taking its place.

7. If we hold that there is a distinction between soul and body, then there is nothing irrational in our believing in what is called the “thought-body.” All the cases of apparitions become intelligible if we accept the possibility of the existence of this thought-body, which also explains those extraordinary cases of mistaken identity and “doubles.”

8. It is a curious fact that phantasms have been frequently observed by dogs and horses, who have exhibited their feelings of terror or joy in the most unmistakable manner. This proves that the particular phantom did not only exist in the fancy of the human being.

9. Photography decides the question, for these phantoms have been photographed. It is idle to say that all these photographs are frauds, and to maintain that even trained scientists taking every possible precaution are still not to be trusted. Some of these photographs any way must be genuine and that is quite sufficient to establish the reality of these phantoms.

10. " Haunted houses furnish the most ancient, the most widely diffused, and the least contestable records of the autonomous, volitional, and persistent activity of the departed."—*C. Lombroso*.

IMAGINARY

1. The permanence or universality of any belief is no indication of its truth, else many contradictory beliefs would be at the same time true. These persistent ghost stories merely point to the constant presence and activity of the imagination in man.

2. When strict tests are applied, then this great mass of facts shrinks to a comparatively few inexplicable cases, and these are not sufficiently clear or frequent to enable us to conclude that these phantasms have any objective reality.

3. We have come to see that the world is governed by definite, ascertainable laws, and that we can have no clear knowledge of what is supernatural. Phantasms are beyond the reach of science, and we can never know whether they exist or not. The safest working assumption seems to be, however, that they are imaginary.

4. The tricks of so many " mediums " have been exposed

that very great caution is required before any of these alleged materializations can be credited. All the "phenomena" of modern séances can be reproduced by good conjurors without difficulty.

5. It is possible for men to believe anything if they set their minds to it, and when even the wisest of men have in the past held strange and now exploded fancies, there is no particular reason why we should believe in phantasms because some wise men of the day believe in them.

6. Real scientific inquiry can only begin when there are actual facts to be dealt with. It is not worth while for science to inquire how these séance tricks are engineered. As long as the alleged facts are as nebulous as the alleged phantoms, sensible men will reserve their judgment and leave investigation of these strange sittings in darkened rooms to faddists.

7. All theories of a thought-body or an astral-body are mere speculations, and science shows us that if we wish to arrive at any truth we must keep our natural tendency to speculate under severe control, and confine ourselves to the verifiable facts of nature. If we follow this teaching of science and common sense, we must be very sceptical of the existence of these phantasms.

8. We can argue nothing from the lower animals, because we know so little about them. We know their structure, but we know not even whether they can think or not. Evidence on this line can count for nothing.

9. The subject of ghost photography is hardly capable of thorough tests, because it is practically impossible to make sure that any given plate has not by accident received some dim image before being used in the camera. What is supposed to be the photo of a ghost is probably the dim photo of a person of flesh and blood which got on to the plate by accident.

10. Haunted houses are more suitable for treatment by novelists than as subjects of serious inquiry. The very fact that this argument is advanced at all shows to what straits the advocates for these supposed phantoms are reduced.

REFERENCES :—

- Psychical Research*, by W. F. Barrett (Home University Library).
After Death—What ? by Cesare Lombroso (Fisher Unwin, 1909).
Occult Science in India, by Louis Jacolliot (W. O. Felt, 1884).
Spiritualism, by J. Arthur Hill (Cassell, 1918).
Phantasms of the Living, by E. Gurney, F. W. Myers, and F. Podmore (Kegan Paul, 1918).
Cock Lane and Common Sense, by Andrew Lang (Longmans, 1896).
Real Ghost Stories (1906) ; and *Letters from Julia* (1914), by W. T. Stead (Stead Publishing House).
In the Next World : a symposium compiled by A. P. Sinnett (Theosophical Publishing Co., 1914).
Across the Stream, by E. F. Benson (Murray, 1919).
 The References given for Debates on "Life after Death" and on "Investigation of Psychic Phenomena" should be consulted.

*Resolved that the two party system is in the best
interests of the country. — 729*

PARTY GOVERNMENT—IS IT A USEFUL OR MISCHIEVOUS SYSTEM ?

USEFUL

1. This system has been developed as the result of the whole history of our country, and ought therefore to be carefully preserved.

2. It is the best practical system for us, insuring as it does that every measure shall be adequately discussed before passing into law.

3. Coalition Governments have always been failures except in certain times of national crisis.

4. It introduces discipline into the debates by discouraging cranks, and does much to prevent that extreme self-assertion which gives rise to so many parties in France. Individual liberty in excess simply means anarchy. Some sort of discipline is as necessary in Parliament as it is on board ship, or in the army.

5. It tends to interest the people in politics without unnecessarily distracting and confusing their minds.

MISCHIEVOUS

1. It is fatal to independence of judgment, leading men to vote more because they belong to a certain party than because they approve the principle of a measure.

2. Loyalty to party is apt to become the great guiding principle for the majority of the members of Parliament,

and this is but a poor substitute for loyalty to conviction.

3. No consistent and far-sighted policy is possible, and so statesmen are apt to adopt a hand-to-mouth policy suited to the needs of the hour and the necessity of vote-catching.

4. It has a tendency to make both politicians and the public narrow-minded, bigoted, unpatriotic, suspicious, violent and uncharitable.

5. It springs from a false notion of freedom which makes the Government unstable and the ministers timorous.

6. The effect of it is that the country is governed by a narrow oligarchy of wealthy families.

REFERENCES :—

The Science of Politics, by Sheldon Amos, chaps. ii. and vi. (International Scientific Series).

Considerations on Representative Government, by John S. Mill.

Essays, by David Hume (Nos. viii. and ix.).

Liberalism, by L. T. Hobhouse; and *Conservatism*, by Lord Hugh Cecil (Home University Library).

Towards a National Policy, by H. Roberts (Murray).

Party and People, by Cecil Chesterton (Alston Rivers, 1910).

The Party System, by C. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc (1911).

Human Nature in Politics, by Graham Wallas (Constable, 1908).

The Tyranny of Shams, by Joseph McCabe (Eveleigh Nash, 1916).

Democracy at the Crossways (chap. xii.), by F. J. C. Hernshaw (Macmillan, 1918).

Mr. Clutterbuck's Election, by Hilaire Belloc (Eveleigh Nash, 1908).

Articles : "The Bankruptcy of Party," by Arthur A. Baumann (*Contemporary Review*, July, 1917). "The Abolition of Party Government," by F. G. Stone (*Nineteenth Century*, April, 1918).

OUGHT WE TO SUBMIT TO THE TYRANNY OF CONVENTION ?

NO

1. If people had always submitted to convention in the past, we should still be wearing trunk hose and crinolines ; there would have been no reformation and little progress.

2. If we go into details we see that in religion, science, art, philosophy and literature progress has been brought about by active resistance to the conventions of the day.

3. There is a difference between what is essentially annoying to society, such as untidy clothing, dirty boots and loud talking, and what is annoying only because of some convention or custom, such as the refusal to wear gloves, or a tall hat, or a high collar. This distinction is real and easily applicable, and keeps the intelligent reformer from the abuse of his liberty.

4. The party of order are perpetually imprisoning themselves in conventional dungeons of their own building, and it is the plain duty of the innovator to persevere in the endeavour to free himself and them.

5. The tyranny of convention is as severe as any other tyranny, not in any particular case, but in the sum total of its restrictions. It causes immense extravagance, and at the same time a decrease in the amount of social intercourse, because it has made it the custom to give large,

infrequent and tedious entertainments instead of small, frequent and lively ones. The result is that just those who need it most are driven from society and seek real social pleasure in degenerating surroundings; in short, lives are worn out in the service of etiquette, and pleasure freezes under its icy breath. The need of strenuous reform, therefore, and of stout resistance, is plain, for many social conventions must take rank among the crowned follies of the world.

YES

1. If this principle were once generally admitted, it would bring in the reign of cranks and faddists, and tend to the utter confusion of society.

2. Custom is always changing, and there is no such thing as a fixed custom. It is well that established customs should die slowly, in order that reforms may be adequately tested before being adopted.

3. There are a great number of unwritten customs of society which, though apparently trifling in themselves, yet are very useful in keeping up the refinement and politeness necessary to a civilized community. No one can estimate the beneficent effect of these little politenesses and mutual considerations which society exacts.

4. It is not wise for the reformer to resist the conventions of society, because if he does so he gets the reputation of being a crank, and his opinion on serious matters does not receive the weight it otherwise would.

5. If a man is to be allowed to offend one canon of accepted taste, why not all? The line can be drawn nowhere short of a relapse into irresponsible barbarism. When a man breaks through forms, he is only asserting his own selfish wish against the well-understood preference of the majority of his fellow-men. Even if he disapprove of

the custom, he should still make some effort to conform, in order to avoid the danger of being both unjust and ungenerous.

REFERENCES :—

- Essays : Political, Scientific, Speculative*, by Herbert Spencer.
Conventional Lies of our Civilization, by Max Nordau (Heinemann).
On Compromise, by Lord Morley of Blackburne (Macmillan, 1886).
The Tyranny of Shams, by Joseph McCabe (Eveleigh Nash, 1916).
Self and Self-Management (chap. i., "Running away from Life"), by E. Arnold Bennett (Hodder & Stoughton, 1918.)
The Crowd (a study in crowd psychology), by G. Le Bon (Fisher Unwin, 1903).
 Two Plays : *The Doll's House*, by Ibsen ; and *The Mob*, by John Galsworthy.
What is Coming ? by H. G. Wells (Cassell, 1916).
The Emancipation of English Women, by W. Lyon Blease (Nutt, 1913).
Life of Florence Nightingale, by Sir Edward Cook (Macmillan, 1913).
Life of Josephine Butler, by G. W. and L. A. Johnson (Arrowsmith, 1911).
 Two novels by Robert Hugh Benson : *The Conventionalists* (Hutchinson, 1908) ; and *The Sentimentalists* (Pitman, 1906).
 Articles : "The Ethics of Intercourse," by W. R. Tapley (*Hibbert Journal*, April, 1919). "Sentimentalists," by Lucien Johnston (*Ecclesiastical Review*, Jan. 1916).

REINCARNATION

FOR

1. Three main hypotheses have been advanced to explain the riddle of life and death. (a) The materialistic theory, which though almost universal for a time is now being abandoned even by scientists themselves. (b) The theological theory that each person is a new creation at birth whose fate for eternity is decided by the infinitesimal span of one mortal life. The unsatisfactoriness of this doctrine is becoming more manifest every day. (c) The theory of re-birth, which teaches repeated embodiment in gradually improving vehicles. This last doctrine is in accordance with the evolution and phenomena of nature. The trees and flowers die every winter to be re-born every spring. Men sink into unconsciousness every night to awake rejuvenated each morning. The law of cyclic re-birth is universal.

2. The law of reincarnation with its companion law of consequence or " karma " is the only ethically sound one, for it alone can explain the inequalities of the human lot. It is manifestly unjust to demand the same achievement from men born with extremely differing opportunities ; but if our present opportunity depends on our past action and each incarnation is only a stage in an infinite progress, then many of the deepest problems of life become comprehensible.

3. Genius is not hereditary and is inexplicable on any other theory than that of reincarnation. Everything must have an adequate cause : what then is the cause of genius or exceptional talent ? It can only come as the result of patient labour in previous incarnations.

4. Reincarnation is no new doctrine of a " fancy religion," but has been held from the very earliest times by the most advanced thinkers of every age, in the ancient East, in Egypt, in Greece and Rome, through the middle ages, down to the present time. Transmigration of souls is merely a popular debasement of this doctrine, arising from a grotesque misunderstanding of its real significance. Reincarnation has generally formed part of the esoteric doctrine of the religions. It was seldom openly taught, because the people were not sufficiently educated to understand its significance. There is good ground for thinking that it formed an important part of Christ's private teaching and that it only dropped out of official Christian theology on account of the incessant theological bickerings over less essential doctrines.

5. That we do not remember our past incarnations is no argument against this doctrine, for we do not remember our earliest childhood, yet it has had its inevitable effect upon our whole career. We cannot recall the details of how we learned to walk, or write or calculate or read, yet every hour spent in acquiring these arts has told on our present proficiency. In the same way, though we cannot remember our past lives, yet we should not be what we are if we had not lived them.

AGAINST

1. This doctrine is a purely speculative one. There are no facts to sustain it, and it is in itself highly improbable, in fact a grotesque nightmare.

2. We are not discussing the ethical soundness of this theory, but simply whether it is true or not. If humanity has been advancing by repeated "incarnations," then we should see a great improvement in intellect and morals, but there is little sign of it. "It is doubtful whether we have *really* advanced from the time of Socrates and Plato, or from that of the authors of the Maha-Bharata"—*Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace*.

3. The qualities of mind and soul are entirely hereditary. Children derive their peculiarities from their parents, grandparents and great grand-parents in ever lessening proportion. This has been traced so often as to have become almost an established law of nature. Exactly how geniuses are produced we do not know, but we find that they always appear in a family whose hereditary influences were in some way favourable.

4. Arguments founded on the length of time any theory has been held or on the number of people who have maintained it, lack validity, for the falsest doctrines have often been long maintained and widely held, *e.g.* that the earth was flat, and the like. There is no evidence that reincarnation ever formed part of Christ's teaching. This is a specimen of the sort of vague supposition on which the whole argument is built up.

5. That we have not the faintest memory of these alleged past lives is conclusive against the theory. We do not ask that we should remember all the details, but we should have at least some reminiscence. This total break in consciousness destroys the theory, for it is not possible that we should benefit from experiences that we do not know we have had. Continuity of consciousness is necessary to personality.

REFERENCES :—

- An Outline of Occult Science*, by Rudolf Steiner (Theosophical Publishing Co., 1914).
- Theosophy*, by Rudolf Steiner (Kegan Paul, 1910).
- Theosophy*, by C. C. Martindale (Catholic Truth Society, 1913).
- The Rosicrucian Cosmo-Conception*, by Max Heindel (L. N. Fowler, 1911).
- The Rosicrucian Mysteries, an elementary exposition*, by Max Heindel (L. N. Fowler, 1911).
- Reincarnation*, by Annie Besant (Theosophical Publishing Co., 1910).
- Esoteric Buddhism*, by A. P. Sinnett (Chapman & Hall, 1888).
- Our Life after Death*, by Arthur Chambers (Charles Taylor, 1917).
- The Time Spirit*, by R. Dimsdale Stocker (Erskine McDonald, 1913).
- What happens after Death?* a symposium (Cassell, 1916).
- Have we lived on Earth before?* a symposium (*London Magazine*, Dec. 1904).

SHOULD HOSPITALS BE MAINTAINED AND MANAGED BY THE STATE ?

YES

1. Charity is a very uncertain source of income nowadays, when benevolent men have so little money to spare and the greedy absorb so much. Voluntary subscriptions are also inadequate, for it is estimated that there is Hospital Service available for only twenty to fifty per cent. of the people who require it.

2. The abuses which now go on, such as the undue experiment upon patients, overcrowding and the waste of money in careless administration, would be rectified.

3. The State would manage the hospitals in such a way that much of the stigma of charity would be removed.

4. It would tend to increase their efficiency and to prevent well-to-do people getting advice and medicine for nothing.

5. Even though the doctors might have to be paid, that would be better than allowing the hospitals to be, as at present, mainly institutions for the teaching of medicine, and only secondarily for the relief of suffering.

NO

1. The calling forth of private charity is a good thing, and if this channel were dried up, it would be to the loss of the State.

2. State management would be more expensive, introducing as it would all the evils of officialism and red-tape.

3. We are getting into the way of putting everything upon the State to the loss on the part of the whole people of individual energy, resource and independence.

4. If hospitals are to be maintained out of the rates, they will not be able to refuse patients, as at present, and the well-to-do will escape their doctors' fees even more frequently.

5. The doctors would no longer give their services gratis but would have to be paid, which would greatly increase the expenses of management.

6. The public is only too ready to listen to general charges against the hospitals without demanding any proof.

REFERENCES :—

The Nationalization of Health, by Havelock Ellis (Fisher Unwin, 1892).

The Dawn of the Health Age, by Prof. Benjamin Moore (Churchill, 1911).

Modern Surgery and its Making (Simpkin Marshall, 1911); and *The Whole Armour of Man* (Grant Richards, 1919), by C. W. Saleeby.

Essays in Wartime : First Series, by Havelock Ellis (Constable, 1916).

Socialism and the Great State : a symposium (*Health and Healing in the Great State*, by C. J. Bond) (Harper, 1912).

Life and Labour in London (Final Volume, Part iii.), by Charles Booth (Macmillan, 1903).

The Scientific Press, Ltd., publishes many books and pamphlets relating to Hospitals by Sir Henry Burdett.

The year-book, *Burdett's Hospitals and Charities*, and the Reports issued by the various hospitals should be consulted for statistics.

OUGHT WE TO GRANT SELF-GOVERNMENT TO INDIA ?

YES

1. We are attempting to govern the natives of India, whose whole habits of thought are widely different from ours. The only way to govern successfully under these circumstances would be to give absolute discretion to Europeans on the spot thoroughly acquainted with the nature of the natives ; but instead of doing this, we consider it wise to appoint over the head of the viceroy a minister at home who knows nothing of the subject.

2. The result of our policy is that we are trying to impose our ideas upon the natives without due regard to their ideas, and we, who are supposed to represent freedom, are thus guilty of the greatest tyranny.

3. An intelligent despotism of informed opinion on the spot might be useful and good for the natives, but we continue a despotism of uninformed and ever-changing popular opinion which the party in power represents for the time. India is thus often turned into a playground for faddists and cranks, and the natives suffer the tyranny of our uninformed zeal.

4. Our policy should therefore be gradually to train up the natives to rule themselves, and, when they become capable, to hand over the government to them.

5. " I cannot believe that a people numbering one-sixth

of the whole inhabitants of the globe, whose aspirations have been nourished from their earliest youth on the strong food of English liberty, can be permanently denied a voice in the government of their country."—*Sir William Hunter*.

6. British taxation is a terrible drain on the resources of India. Why is the great principle "no taxation without representation" not applied? The cost of British government alone is enormous.

7. This is no "dismemberment of the Empire." What the most intelligent Indians want is that their country should become a self-governing unit in a federal empire of which Great Britain will be the centre. There is no doubt about the great strength of this national movement, which has now purged itself of the excesses provoked by oppression and is determined to win freedom.

8. The Indian is only demanding for himself in India the very thing the Englishman has always demanded in England. Does the colour of his skin necessarily make the Indian a thrall? Is it not the English "angle of vision" that is at fault here?

9. "India—a buttress or a peril"; the price of loyalty is freedom; the penalty of tyranny is complete dismemberment.

NO

1. We should endeavour to understand better the Indian mind, and should give more power and responsibility to informed opinion. We should reform our own administration while attempting to reform the natives; but that is not to say that we should contemplate abandoning the country, which would be a suicidal and foolish policy.

2. The very cry, "India for the Indians," is a cry of uninformed opinion, because experts tell us that if our strong rule were removed, anarchy would be the result.

The most intelligent natives see so clearly the practical benefits of our rule that they do not wish it removed.

3. We have won India by the sword, and we must keep it by the sword if necessary, unless we are to abandon what we fought for, and undo at a blow the beneficent effects secured by so lavish an expenditure of blood and treasure.

4. If we were to contemplate magnanimously retiring from our hard-won Empire, the action would be misunderstood and attributed to cowardice or to weakness. Our policy of training the natives in our own methods and admitting them to posts in the Government by competitive examination is a thoroughly bad one, because we turn out men "with the heads of professors and the hearts of hares," who are despised by their own fellow countrymen.

5. From the first the people of India have been associated with the government in ruling the country. The government has always been very sensitive to the sentiments, interests and even to the prejudices of the people, *e.g.*—*suttee* and female infanticide were long tolerated on principles of excessive and mistaken toleration.

6. "We have now as it were before us in that vast congeries of peoples we call India, a long slow march in uneven stages through all the centuries from the fifth to the twentieth."—*Lord Morley*. Out of 350 million inhabitants little more than one million have a knowledge of English or are anything but contented and indifferent to this question.

7. Indian unrest is localized in certain districts, the rest of the country is peaceful and contented. This cannot be called a national movement : it is merely a passing agitation by a party of irreconcilables.

8. "We have the strange spectacle in certain parts of India of a party capable of resorting to methods which are both reactionary and revolutionary, of men who offer prayers and sacrifices to ferocious divinities and denounce

the government by seditious journalism, preaching primitive superstition in the very modern form of leading articles."—*Sir Alfred Lyall*.

9. The most important question is—when will India be ripe for self-government? England will not hold on to power in the face of a really universal demand for self-government, but in the meantime she does not want to hand over the masses of the Indian people to anarchy and class exploitation.

REFERENCES :—

- The Oxford Student's History of India*, by Vincent Smith (Oxford Univ. Press, 1917).
The Civilization of India, by Romesh Dutt (Temple Primers, Dent, 1900).
The People and Problems of India, by T. W. Holderness (Home University Library, 1912).
Poverty and Un-British Rule in India, by Dadabhai Naoroji (Son-nenschein, 1901).
India and the Future, by William Archer (1917).
India, a Nation, by Annie Besant (Jack's Peoples' Books, 1915).
India and the Empire, by Annie Besant (Theosophical Publishing Co., 1914.)
India and its Faiths, by James Bissett Pratt (1916).
Actual India, by A. Sawtelle (1904).
"Prosperous" British India, by William Digby (Fisher Unwin 1901).
The Ruin of India by British Rule, by H. M. Hyndman (Twentieth Century Press, 1907).
The Awakening of India, by De Witt McKenzie (Hodder & Stoughton, 1917).

IS THE DIVISION OF LABOUR NOW CARRIED TO HURTFUL EXCESS ?

YES

1. Every man has varied capacities, and the modern habit of confining a man strictly to one definite form of activity cramps his whole nature and starves his life.

2. A certain amount of specialization is necessary from the fact that men's qualities are different, but this differentiation has in modern life been carried to a mischievous extreme, making men one-sided. The evil of this tendency is seen in the decline of art, in pessimism and degeneracy.

3. The great triumphs of ingenuity in labour-saving machinery have only tended further to subdivide labour, until artisans are each confined to so small a detail of production that they lose all artistic interest in their work and become discontented. If this process is allowed to go on unchecked, it will spread into all departments of life, until the majority of men become the hopeless slaves of routine.

4. This excessive subdivision is not in the interest of efficiency, as is seen by comparing modern craftsmanship with ancient. A workman must have a sufficiently wide field to develop his interest, or else he will become a mere machine, turning out work because he has to, and not because he likes it.

NO

1. The modern subdivision of labour makes men specialists. They develop an expertness otherwise unattainable ; their work is thus done more easily and commands higher wages.

2. It is the teaching of science that as development advances specialization of function increases. This tendency cannot be successfully resisted.

3. The scientific triumphs of the age are due to this subdivision of labour. It is only by men devoting their whole lives to one special branch of knowledge that this progress has been made. The present social evils cannot be attributed to machinery or the excessive subdivision of labour, but are mainly attributable to the selfishness of the few luxuriating upon the labour of the many.

4. The cramping effect of increasing subdivision on labour is more than counterbalanced by the innumerable wide interests which have been brought into the lives of all by the development of popular institutions, the newspaper press, cheap books, general education, rapid communication, the post, telegraph and the like. Life is far richer than it used to be, in spite of all the subdivision of labour.

REFERENCES :—

The Human Machine and Industrial Efficiency, by Fred. S. Lee (Longmans, 1919).

Economics (chap. ii.), by Henry Clay (Macmillan, 1916).

Problems of Modern Industry, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb (Longmans, 1902).

The Future of Work, by Leo Chiozza Money, chap. ii., 4 (Fisher Unwin, 1914).

Life and Labour in London (Second Series, " Industry "), by Charles Booth (Macmillan, 1903).

An Alphabet of Economics, by A. R. Orage (Fisher Unwin, 1917).

Towards Industrial Freedom, chap. vi., by Edward Carpenter (Allen & Unwin, 1917).

The Heart of the Empire : a symposium ; chap. v., " The Distribution of Industry," by P. W. Wilson (Fisher Unwin, 1901).

The Aims of Art, by William Morris.

SMALL HOLDINGS

FOR

1. The real strength of France rests on the prosperity of its peasant farmers. It was this prosperity of the small holder which enabled France to pay off in so short a time the crushing war indemnity of 1871. There is no reason why we also should not develop a strong peasant proprietor class by the extension of small holdings.

2. The great success of the allotments during the war demonstrates the advantage of the intensive cultivation which is the result of small holdings, and which is impossible on a large estate.

3. The degeneration resulting from overcrowded city life has been so clearly demonstrated that it is highly desirable to get as large a proportion of men as possible back to the land, both for material and spiritual reasons. Small holdings are the only and the best means of achieving this great purpose.

4. The small holding develops energy and independence in the peasant proprietor. If the farmer has a bad year he appeals to the landlord, who often stands between him and the consequences of his own bad management or want of industry, but the small-holder must stand on his own legs or fall. Independence and personal responsibility are the best spurs to successful effort.

5. The war has taught us the extreme danger of relying almost entirely on imported food. The decay of agriculture is a national calamity which may have decisive consequences in time of war. Small holdings is the best way of reviving agriculture and increasing the supplies of home-grown food. This is the most satisfactory way also of finding suitable and useful employment for demobilized soldiers.

. AGAINST

1. The conditions here are quite different from those of France. With us the requirements of the government inspectors are much more stringent,—*e.g.* concrete floors are required for dairies. The improvements demanded would be beyond the means of the small-holder.

2. The tenant-farmers on large estates are all in favour of maintaining the present system on account of the personal attachment between tenant and landlord. They would much rather work for the landlord they know than for some corporate body such as a County Council.

3. The farmer requires so much capital for his agricultural implements and machines that he has none to spare for purchasing his farm. He usually has no desire to buy his farm, because his rent is much lower, as a rule, than the interest on the money required to buy the land.

4. The large proprietors are usually ready to meet their tenants in times of difficulty: when bad seasons come rents are postponed or reduced. Thus the farmer is often saved from inevitable bankruptcy by the consideration of the large proprietor. But under a system of small holdings nothing could save the unsuccessful from failure and in bad years there might be widespread misery.

5. In order to be successful the small holding must be self-supporting. No scheme of small holdings which requires constant government subventions to save the proprietors

from ruin could maintain itself for long. Under our present system the small holding could not be made self-supporting, and until some more workable legislation is devised the small holdings plan must be regarded as practically impossible on any adequate scale.

REFERENCES :—

- Report of the Land Enquiry Committee* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1913).
The Agricultural Holdings Acts, by Thos. E. Jackson (Sweet & Maxwell, 1917).
The English Land System, by J. A. R. Marriott (Murray, 1914).
The Growth of the Manor, by P. G. Vinogradov (G. Allen, 1911).
Small Holdings, and How Landlords can Create Small Holdings, by L. Jebb (Murray, 1917).
The Tyranny of the Countryside (Fisher Unwin, 1913); and *The Awakening of England* (Nelson, 1918), by F. E. Green.
The Way of Peace, by H. Fielding-Hall (Hurst & Blacket, 1917).
The National Being, (Ireland), by George Russell (Maunsell, 1916).
Problems of Village Life, by E. N. Bennett (Home University Library).
Customary Acres and their Historical Importance, by F. Seeböhm (Longmans, 1914).
The State as Farmer, by George Radford (Smith Elder, 1915).
Large and Small Holdings, by H. Levy (Cambridge University Press, 1911).
Rural Regeneration in England, by W. Sutherland (Methuen, 1913).
The Occupying Ownership of Land, by B. Tollemache (Murray, 1913).
The Land Hunger : a symposium (Fisher Unwin).
Towards Industrial Freedom, by Edward Carpenter (Allen & Unwin, 1917).
The Land and the Empire, by Christopher Turnor (Murray, 1917).
Articles : "The Small Holdings Craze," by C. S. Orwin (*Edinburgh Review*, April, 1916). "The Anti-Small Holdings Mania," by Christopher Turnor (*Nineteenth Century*), Sept. 1916. "Small Holdings for Women," by Olive Hocken (*The Englishwoman*, May, 1919).
The References given for Debates on Taxation of Land Values and on Landed Gentry should also be consulted.

SHOULD PARLIAMENT RESTRAIN EXCESSIVE LUXURY ?

YES

1. Whatever a man has in excess of what is necessary for maintaining the health and comfort of life should be devoted in some way to the public good, and just in proportion as he spends this surplus upon himself in useless luxury does he defraud the community.

2. Although this is acknowledged by many as an abstract principle, yet it is only acted upon in very exceptional circumstances, and in order to secure the working of the rule, society will have to take some active measures.

3. Society has the right of protecting itself against the luxury of its individual members, because it is only through the protection afforded to them by society that the greedy members are able to absorb more than their share of the available good.

4. Luxury is in itself directly a danger to society, as is witnessed by the decay of the ancient civilizations through the enervation of their individual members following in the track of luxury. If some means are not devised to check this evil, we can only hope to follow the path of national degeneration until some more healthy and virile race arises to supplant us.

5. The failure of the ancient sumptuary laws does not imply that legislation for the restraint of luxury is impossible

in modern times. Some system of heavy taxation upon luxuries would tend to restrain their use and at the same time bring in a large revenue to the State.

6. It is idle to contend that luxury is not mischievous in its working, because private expenditure encourages trade. Money spent selfishly gives work with a resulting gratification to the individual, whereas money spent unselfishly creates just as much work, and the result is to the permanent good of the community. If there were any value in the argument, it would apply with equal force in favour of the maintenance of gambling hells, the drink traffic and the like.

7 Ancient kings and conquerors, who sought their own pleasure and aggrandisement only, do not differ essentially from modern luxurious men, the latter deserve all the condemnation heaped upon the former.

NO

1. If this rule were carried into practice, men would not exert themselves beyond the point where their exertions would benefit themselves, and the result would be that enterprise would be checked, work would become more scarce, and the conditions of life harder than ever.

2. It is impossible for society to insist upon general benevolence, for this is a matter for individual decision over which society has no control.

3. This principle cannot be admitted without the most extensive consequences ; if society has the right of protecting itself against individual luxury then also it has the right of protecting itself against individual malice, meanness, hypocrisy and the like. The result of the establishment of this theory would be a tyranny such as has never been witnessed before.

4. It was not so much luxury as idleness which was the

ruin of ancient society. In modern times luxury is seldom attainable except by the most energetic members of society, and these are just those who are best fitted to withstand its temptations. Even where wealth is inherited, if the inheritor is lavish and wasteful, then there is a tendency for him to sink into a lower social position in which this waste is no longer possible. In this way excessive luxury corrects itself by the automatic working of the economic laws.

5. Ancient sumptuary laws, such as those of Rome, were conspicuous failures, and we have no evidence that any modern revival of the practice would be more successful.

6. Lavish expenditure is not an evil altogether, for part of the expenditure goes directly to benefit trade. This is shown by the fact that when the Court goes into mourning London trade suffers severely, because the expenditure of the wealthy is reduced.

7. It is easy to denounce ancient tyrants, and to forget that it is through their energy and ambition that modern nations have grown and peace and good order have been made possible. The future will probably owe as much to our wealthy and enterprising men of to-day.

REFERENCES :—

- Luxury*, by Emile de Laveleye (Sonnenschein, 1891).
The Distribution of Income, by Prof. William Smart (Macmillan, 1912).
Poverty and Waste, by Hartley Withers (Smith Elder, 1914).
The Camel and the Needle's Eye, by Arthur Ponsonby (Fifield, 1910).
Public Service v. Private Expenditure, by Sir Oliver Lodge (Fabian Tract).
The Unearned Increment, by W. H. Dawson (Sonnenschein, 1891).
Socialism for Millionaires, by G. Bernard Shaw (Fabian Tract).
New Worlds for Old, by H. G. Wells (Constable, 1914).
Aristocracy and Evolution, by W. H. Mallock (Black, 1898).
The Taxation of Capital, by A. Soward and W. E. Willan (Waterlow, 1919).
The Division of the Product of Industry, by Arthur L. Bowley (Oxford University Press, 1919).

HAS THE INTRODUCTION OF MACHINERY DONE MORE HARM THAN GOOD ?

HARM

1. The agricultural depression can be traced to the fact that the extensive use of machinery on the American wheat fields has brought American produce into disastrous competition with European. When it is remembered also that this cheapness of American produce is not only caused by the increased application of machinery to agriculture, but also by the fact that this increased application results in a material reduction of the number of labourers required, it is clear that the total evil resulting from machinery is very great,

2. In the cotton industry and in printing the result of the increasing use of machinery is seen to be the employment of fewer hands, the aggregation of immense capital (always necessary for setting up extensive machinery), and the crushing out of small enterprises. Many of our most serious social evils have their root in the growing use of machinery : the old personal relation between master and servant is forgotten in a gigantic mill, and the poor and the rich become established in hostile camps.

3. The so-called labour-saving machines do not really save labour, for, says John Stuart Mill, "Hitherto it is questionable if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lessened the day's toil of any human being."

4. The quality of the work done has degenerated since the introduction of machinery, for, though there is a great uniformity in machine-made products, there is not the excellence of quality found in the old hand-made products.

5. The life of the workman is made intolerably monotonous and dull by machinery. "The constant employment on one sixty-fourth part of a shoe not only offers no encouragement to mental activity, but dulls by its monotony the brains of the employé to such an extent that the power to think and reason is almost lost" (*Contemporary Review*, 1889, p. 392).

6. Machinery has the most desolating effect upon the beauty and health of whole districts, e.g. the black country, etc.

GOOD

1. Machinery as applied to agriculture has made the resources of the world available for the needs of the world. A famine in any part of the world can now be prevented to a large extent; the simple necessities of life have also become much cheaper, and though, as this progress has gone on, men have been thrown out of employment by machinery, yet other fields of activity have opened up which more than compensate.

2. A considerable number of entirely new industries have been created by machinery, one of the most striking instances of this being the vast railway enterprises of the world. The evil effects of machinery as regards the relation of capital and labour are temporary, and are being steadily remedied (*vide* the Factory Acts).

3. This statement of J. S. Mill's is a gross exaggeration, for we see in the short-hour movement an indication of the fact that the labour-saving machines do save labour, and generally it may be observed that the condition of the

working man to-day under the sway of machinery is much better than it used to be in the old time.

4. The quality of machine-made work is on the whole better than that of hand-made work, because there is a precision about a machine not to be attained by the best workman. The mathematical regularity, perfection of control, and high speed found in machines produce a quality of work which makes reverting to old conditions out of the question.

5. This is a temporary condition, for as machinery becomes more perfected, one man will be able to supervise a larger number of machines, and his work will become more interesting and less exacting. It is to be hoped that the time may come when machinery will be made to do all the unintellectual work of the world.

6. This is a purely sentimental objection to machinery, and is being removed as electricity replaces steam as a motive power.

REFERENCES :—

Ideas at War (chap. iv., "The Mechanical Age"; and chap x., "Arts and Crafts"), by Patrick Geddes and G. Slater (Williams & Norgate, 1917).

✓ *The Future of Work*, by Leo Chiozza Money, chap. ii. (Fisher Unwin, 1914).

The Human Machine and Industrial Efficiency, by Fred. S. Lee (Longmans, 1919).

Life and Labour in London, vol. v., Part 2, by Charles Booth (Macmillan, 1903).

✓ *An Alphabet of Economics*, by A. R. Orage (Fisher Unwin, 1917).

Problems of Modern Industry (chap. x.); and *Industrial Democracy* (chap. viii.), by Sidney and Beatrice Webb (Longmans, 1902).

✓ *The Heart of the Empire: a symposium*; chap. v. (Fisher Unwin, 1901).

Economics, by Henry Clay (Macmillan, 1916).

ARE MODERN CHRISTIAN MISSIONS A FAILURE ?

NO

1. We have only a comparatively short period of Christian enterprise upon which to pass an opinion. When this period is attentively considered, it will become manifest that Christians of this century have succeeded almost as well as Christians of the first century in missionary enterprise.

2. It may be objected that the majority of the converts are poor and of no political or social influence, but this was equally true of the converts of the first century. It is characteristic of Christianity at its best that it comes "with good tidings to the poor." It is to be noted, also, that when these degraded people adopt Christianity they at once improve in moral character, and consequently begin to rise.

3. The success of Christian missions is fully manifested in the effect produced upon the consideration in which women are held. Wherever Christianity makes its way, there women are in process of taking their just place in the esteem of men.

4. Some of the most eminent officials in India, such as Lord Lawrence, Sir Bartle Frere, and Sir Richard Temple, have testified to the success of Christian missions. Other witnesses are also quoted, *e.g.* General Sir Herbert Edwardes,

Sir Donald McLeod, Lord Napier and Ettrick, Sir W. W. Hunter (statistical department).

5. The excellence of the Buddhist literature gives no idea of the religion in its practical results. Viewed as a practice, Buddhism is a failure, and where Christianity supplants it, at once a higher standard of conduct appears.

6. Christianity may have departed to some extent from its primitive beauty and simplicity at home, but the very idea of missionary enterprise is characteristic of Christianity at its purest, and the success of Christian missions is not only assured in itself by the very nature of their message, but carries with it the promise of reform at home.

7. The people to whom the missionaries go are sunk in ignorance, lethargy, and misery. Only a few of them know of the best parts of their own religion, and they are consequently the victims of every kind of superstition. Nothing but Christianity can rouse them, and the extraordinary success of its missions justifies the appeal for more energy and money for this great work.

YES

1. It is impossible to obtain trustworthy statistics, for no two authorities agree. Arguments based upon the conversion of a number of wholly ignorant people cannot be sound, because (1) it is impossible to see the motive which influenced these poor converts. Is it because they really believe Christianity to be the truth, or is it because they want to be doctored or clothed or fed or taught? (2) It is highly probable that they could be converted back to their old religion without much difficulty. It is possible to "convert" ignorant and weak-minded people to anything.

2. The conversions among the intelligent classes are

very rare, and, though it is characteristic of Christianity to begin with the poor, surely it is not also one of its characteristics to continue to be confined to the ignorant.

3. We do not understand the position of women in the East, but we may well be astonished at the chastity and sobriety which prevailed in India before we introduced the lust of drink and the lust of gold, which are such noticeable indications of the vitality of our Christian faith.

4. Christian missions have been a success in so far as they have been a means of bringing East and West in contact, and of enabling us to understand some of the ancient religions of the East, and to broaden our views ; but, as far as the propagating of any particular dogmas (such as those of Evangelicalism) are concerned, they are a conspicuous failure.

5. In its history, Christianity has failed in its missionary efforts against Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Mohammedanism, Brahminism, and Buddhism. It can teach to the Easterns nothing that they have not got already in their own religion, and as to the conduct of life, Christians would do well to sit at the feet of Buddhists.

6. Christianity has so far departed from its truest principles that it is practically a failure here in England. Our vice, intemperance, greed of gold do not yield to the dogmas with which we have obscured Christianity ; how can we expect, then, that these dogmas which fail so miserably at home should succeed abroad ?

7. The people to whom the missionaries go cannot by any possibility be called heathen. Often their conduct of life compares favourably with that of the missionaries themselves. Their ancient religions not only satisfy the aspirations of the poorest and most ignorant, but represent to the wise and gifted the highest flights of which human spirits are capable. Christianity, on the other hand, as

taught by the missionaries is notoriously unsatisfactory to the great majority of our cleverest men.

In the above arguments statistics have been avoided, under the impression that very few of them are reliable ; but those who want figures should consult the reports of the various missionary societies. Statistics will also be found in the following :

REFERENCES :—

- Missions*, by Louise Creighton (Home University Library, 1912).
The Missionary Question, by M. R. Newbolt (Robert Scott, 1918).
The Missionary Prospect (Partridge) and *A History of Christian Missions* (T. & T. Clark), by Dr. G. H. Robinson.
Catholicity, by R. Heber Newton (Putnams, 1918).
India and its Faiths, by James Bissett Pratt (Constable, 1916).
Friends beyond Seas, by H. T. Hodgkin (Headley, 1916).
The World and the Gospel, by Joseph H. Oldham (Council for Missionary Education, 1916).
The Missionary Spirit and the Present Opportunity, by Henry T. Hodgkin (Headley, 1916).

ARE PRIVATE MONOPOLIES PUBLIC EVILS ?

YES

1. The old monopolies, such as were granted by Queen Elizabeth and James I, were made illegal by the Statute of Monopolies passed in 1623, and monopolies in this old arbitrary sense cannot be revived ; but in modern times the stress of competition has become so severe that capitalists often unite, and by getting control of an entire industry create a monopoly which, though it be obtained by legal means, is just as disastrous in its effects as the old monopoly granted by the arbitrary will of the sovereign.

2. When commodities are in the hands of trusts, prices run up, and yet production is rendered cheaper by trusts (the very reason of their existence) ; therefore it is the public which has to pay the vast profits on the trusts.

3. This public payment of increased prices is simply another form of taxation—public taxation for private ends, which is an infringement of one of the cardinal principles of liberty, “ no taxation without representation.”

4. Under trusts the workmen are completely in the hands of the capitalists, because the competition among the capitalists for the best workmen is removed, and these men must either work at the wage the trust is willing to give, or must starve. The natural tendency of monopolies in private hands is thus to depress wages.

5. This evil is all the more terrible as it seems practically

beyond the reach of law, because it is so hard to make out that any given trust is legally a "monopoly" or a "conspiracy."

NO

1. Modern monopolies differ radically from ancient ones and, so far from injuring the public, they confer many benefits; *e.g.* under unrestrained private competition adulteration flourishes, because it is often the only way for the small capitalist to escape financial ruin; but when trusts and combinations take the field then adulteration ceases, the cause of it, competition, being removed.

2 and 3. Trusts do a great public service by showing that competition is not necessary to the life of trade, but on the other hand, that co-operation reduces the expenses of production and raises the quality of the goods. The evils resulting from trusts are temporary, and the only way to escape them is to have larger and larger trusts, until at last the people themselves manage their own industries.

4. Trusts, by their enormous control of capital, are able to develop the resources of a country in a way impossible to private enterprise, and in this way to create far more opportunity for employment than private enterprise can. As Government obtains more and more control of these gigantic trusts, the condition of the wage-earners will be improved. Trusts prevent waste, and put capital to its best use.

5. This is merely an indication that the cure of the evils caused by monopolies is not to be found in legal proceedings. These legal proceedings must be futile, because the monopolies are simply the result of the working of the law of competition, and it is economically impossible to revert to the previous conditions of things. The only remedy plainly lies in obtaining adequate State

control of these monopolies. We have already grasped the fact that natural monopolies, such as gas, water, tramways, etc., are best managed by municipalities, and we have only to take another step to see that artificial monopolies embraced in the various industries are best managed by the State for the public good.

REFERENCES :—

- Monopoly*, by William Morris (address to working men).
Principles of State Interference, by D. G. Ritchie (Sonnenschein, 1902).
A History of Trusts, by M. E. Hirst (Collins).
Trusts, Pools and Corners, by J. S. Jeans (Methuen, 1894).
Facts for the Workers about Protection, Free Trade, and Monopoly, by Philip Snowden (Cassell, 1904).
Monopolies and Trusts, by R. T. Ely (Macmillan, 1900).
The Trust Problem, by J. W. Jenks (Curtis Brown, 1917).
The World of Labour (1913); and *Self-Government in Industry*, by G. D. H. Cole (Bell, 1917).
Economics, by Henry Clay (Macmillan, 1916).
An Alphabet of Economics, by A. R. Orage (Fisher Unwin, 1914).
 Article: "How to Prevent Banking Monopoly," by Sidney Webb (*Contemporary Review*, July, 1918).

MUNICIPAL GAS SUPPLY

FOR

1. The good government of a municipality is improved according as its functions are wisely extended, and this rule demonstrates its truth in the matter of gas supply.

2. If a private company manage the gas supply, they manage it in the interest of their shareholders, and the good of the public is only a secondary consideration with them ; whereas if the municipality are the managers, they act mainly in the interest of the public, which means a good supply, as cheap as possible, and an honest administration.

3. The experience of such cities as Glasgow, Birmingham, etc., which have municipalized their gasworks, all tells in favour of the reform (*e.g.*, in Glasgow the works as taken over produced 6,500,000 cubic feet, and now they have been so improved that they are capable of producing 12,000,000 cubic feet : yet in spite of this improvement there is no rate on rental levied for the gas, because the manufacture has proved remunerative at the rate of 4s. per thousand cubic feet, no rent for meters.—*Encyc. Brit.*).

4. When the gasworks are under the municipality, the interest of the employés is regarded (*e.g.*, in Birmingham there has been an eight-hour day for the gas employés

since 1889), but under a gas company the men are apt to be sweated and the public exploited.

5. The natural result of this reform is a large increase in the municipal revenue, which is all for the good of the city.

6. Gas will always be required, even though electricity take its place for lighting purposes, so the reform is as needful as ever.

AGAINST

1. Municipal enterprises are both expensive and ineffective. In taking over the gas supply the municipality goes far beyond its duties, and takes upon it the work which would be better done by private enterprise.

2. A private company must manage their business well, or else it would not pay, and the natural result is that they cater best for the public good.

3. The municipal management of gas supply gives large opportunity for corruption and jobbery. Municipal enterprises suffer under the lethargy and extravagance of officialdom and red-tape.

4. This increasing of the powers of the municipality is just a step towards socialism, and, unless the tendency is discouraged, disastrous results are sure to follow as these irresponsible socialists get more power into their hands.

5. This so-called social reform can only result in the discouragement of private enterprise, in the gradual introduction of all sorts of grandmotherly legislation, to the weakening of the self-reliance and independence of the people.

6. Electricity is rapidly driving out gas, and it would be folly for any municipality to buy out gasworks only to find that there was an ever-dwindling demand for gas.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS

FOR

1. These are now adopted in Huddersfield, Blackpool, Glasgow, Leeds, Plymouth, Dover, Liverpool, Nottingham, Sheffield, etc., and the system has been found to work out larger profits and better service.

2. It is in the interest of private companies to secure high fares, small expenses (including long hours and small wages for the men), and big dividends, whereas when the municipality governs the tramways it aims at low fares, good service (including fair treatment of the men), and reasonable profits.

3. The tramways are a monopoly, and they should not therefore be in private hands, for the temptation to exploit the public, tyrannize over the employés, and doctor the accounts and assessments is too strong to be resisted by a company of eager speculators.

4. Tramway companies obtain excessive influence in city politics, and often succeed in running the council for their own benefit ; this gives rise to much corruption and jobbery.

AGAINST

1. The working of the tramways by the municipality is not a profitable enterprise, because it involves the adoption of expensive philanthropic fads, like the excessive reduction of fares and extravagant pay to the employés.

2. Tramway companies have been very successful, paying high dividends, and in this way have been a real boon to the investing public, especially nowadays, when a good investment is so hard to find.

3. The ruling powers have sufficient control over tramway companies to prevent any injustice to the public, and, besides, it is plainly not in the interest of the companies to exploit the public, but rather to encourage them to make use of the cars by rendering the service as cheap and efficient as possible.

4. Municipal control means the triumph of officialdom and red-tape, and leads to political corruption.

Municipal Trade, by Leonard Darwin (Murray, 1903).

Socialism in Local Government, by W. G. Towler (G. Allen & Sons, 1908).

On Municipal Trading, by Lord Avebury (Macmillan, 1906).

English Local Government, by S. and B. Webb (Longmans, 1906).

Municipal Monopolies (in America) : a symposium (Crowell, 1899).

The Unseen Foundations of Society, by the Duke of Argyll (G. D. Campbell) : chap. xviii. (Murray, 1893).

Duncan's Manual of Tramways, etc. : a year-book of statistics.

The Reports of the L.C.C. and other County and Borough Councils.

Democracy and Liberty, by W. E. H. Lecky. Chap. ix.

The Commonsense of Municipal Trading, by G. B. Shaw (Fifield, 1910).

Municipal Milk, and Municipal Drink Traffic (Fabian Tracts).

OUGHT WE TO ADOPT A SYSTEM OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM ?

YES

1. Parliament is at present unable to grapple with the amount of work it has to do. It has to deal with the affairs of the Empire, of the United Kingdom as a whole, and of the constituent parts of the United Kingdom. As a result, no business is properly handled, and free discussion is necessarily curtailed by the use of the closure.

2. Greater specialization would be possible. A few men attending to a certain set of duties would have a more thorough knowledge of them than if these duties were unlimited as they are now in parliament.

3. Ministers, and especially the head of the government, should be able to grasp thoroughly all matters with which they have to deal. At present this is impossible owing to the great variety of these matters, and they are dependent upon subordinates to too great an extent.

4. Each country of the United Kingdom is compelled from time to time to obey laws which a majority of its inhabitants would reject. That such a question as the disestablishment of the Church in England should be decided by Irish Roman Catholics, Scotch Presbyterians and Welsh dissenters is contrary to the right of self-government.

5. Parliament is Olympian. Occupied as it is with Imperial and foreign affairs, it is apt to get out of touch

with domestic matters and the real needs of the people.

6. The temporary importance of a single question of external affairs may put a government in power which is out of sympathy with the majority of the electors upon domestic matters : or vice versa. *E.g.*, in 1900 Conservative members were returned by a large majority of London constituencies, on the question of the South African war. In the same year in the L.C.C. elections, the Progressives obtained an overwhelming majority.

7. It is the only possible scheme for granting Home Rule to Ireland. It is essential that the Irish demand be met, as the present attitude of that country is a grave danger to the Empire.

8. If the Empire is to avoid disintegration, Imperial federation must be resorted to. A necessary preliminary to this is devolution at home, because the Imperial parliament must be freed from all flavour of parochialism. This is demanded by the dignity and standing of the dominions, and by the practical necessities referred to under heading 1.

NO

1. It is unwise to tamper with the constitution. Constitutional changes, if necessary at all, should be centripetal, not centrifugal. The whole tendency of the age, and one necessary to self-preservation, is towards concentration. The difficulties of carrying on parliamentary business can be met in other ways ; *e.g.*, by an extension of the system of committees and by framing rules for dealing with obstruction. Great difficulties would arise in matters of finance and in the executive.

2. The best men would not be obtained for the local parliaments, and the danger of corruption would be increased. Moreover, if this argument were carried to

its logical conclusion, there would be no end to the demands for subdivision of parliaments.

3. Only general policy needs to be framed by ministers. It is right and proper for them to rely upon subordinates for matters of detail, and more expert knowledge is thus brought to bear upon these details. Ministers should not be specialists.

4. Local minorities would suffer. The very heterogeneity of Parliament is at present a valuable check upon this. The preponderance of Churchmen in England prevents the persecution of their co-religionists in Wales, and the Irish vote protects the Roman Catholics in England. If the power of veto were retained by the supreme parliament as a check upon this evil, the consequence would be quarrels and demands for complete separation.

5. Interests of various sections of the community are not necessarily furthered by a division on geographical lines. And true geographical divisions are not necessarily those upon which the United Kingdom is politically divided.

6. This argument may be valid, but as the example given shows the difficulty is already met by the existence of county councils and kindred bodies. It may well be that further powers might be given to these bodies, but that does not prove the necessity for so drastic a change as that proposed.

7. The Irish question would not be settled by devolution. The demand is for "Ireland a nation" and will only stop with complete separation.

8. An Imperial council is all that is required in this connexion, and not a legislative body.

REFERENCES :—

Federalism and Home Rule, by "Pacificus," 1910.

Federal Government for United Kingdom, by T. A. Brassey, 1902.

Considerations on a Scheme of Federal Government for United Kingdom, by G. R. Benson. 1902.

Home Rule, by Harold Spender, 1912 (Hodder & Stoughton).

The Federal Solution : how it has worked elsewhere, by J. C. Haig (Griffiths, 1914).

Home Rule, by L. G. Redmond-Howard (Jack's Peoples' Books, 1912), includes a bibliography.

All the References given for Debate on p. 118 should be consulted here : and many of those quoted for Debate on p. 52 are also useful.

SHOULD THE POOR LAW BE RECON- STRUCTED ?

YES

1. We employ at present the following means to alleviate the distress of the poor :—

- (a) The Poor Law, with its workhouses, infirmaries, residential schools and outdoor relief.
- (b) Unemployed Workmen Act (1905) with its system of allowances to the families of men for whom it provides work.
- (c) The Provision of Meals Act (1906) and the Education Administrative Provisions Act (1907) which provides food and medical treatment to school children through the education authorities.
- (d) The Old Age Pension Act (1908) which provides pensions for people over 70.
- (e) National Insurance Act and
- (f) Other forms of direct public relief. Besides all this there are countless societies distributing charity to special classes of the poor, as well as many church agencies for charitable relief. All these efforts are carried on together without co-ordination or co-operation, with the result that there is constant overlapping. The frequent consequence is that the deserving poor are forgotten, while the importunate beggar gets far more than he ought.

2. The cost of all these efforts is enormous and the waste simply incalculable, while all the time the real problem of poverty remains untouched.

3. There must be a thorough inquiry into the present muddle. Disorganized private charity is an evil, but disorganized State charity only perpetuates and increases the very trouble it is trying to remove. The only remedy is to bring all public assistance of the poor under one central authority, where it can be systematically organized and efficiently dispensed.

4. It should be our first task after the Great War to set these crying anomalies right and so to reconstruct our Poor Law that it can no more be said that a portion of our people at home are permanently sinking below the standard of civilization of subject races abroad.

NO

1. No mere reconstruction of the Poor Law will meet the difficulty. The real cause of the trouble of the poor lies far deeper than any reconstructed Poor Law can reach, namely at the very root of our whole social system. The time for patching is past : the time for complete reconstruction has come. Nothing but an enlightened State Socialism can remove the curse of poverty.

2. Cobden says :—" Mine is that masculine sort of charity which would inculcate in the minds of the working classes the love of independence, the privilege of self-respect, the disdain of being patronized and petted, the desire to accumulate, and the ambition to rise."

3. Even if poor relief were organized under one authority the result would be no better than under the present system of muddle, because such a central authority would only mean organized officialdom and red-tape. The various departments would be so busy corresponding with each

other about what should be done that the poor would be completely forgotten. Even circumlocution is no cure for poverty.

4. "I do not think there is any doctrine more fatal to the root principles of democratic government than that it should consist in the constant amelioration, at great expense to the community, of the social conditions of the less favoured class in the country at the sole and exclusive expense of other classes."—*Prime Minister in Dec. 1914.*

REFERENCES :—

- Majority and Minority Reports of Royal Commission, 1905-8.
New Poor Law or No Poor Law (Dent, 1s., 1909), (a digest of the two reports).
The Prevention of Destitution, by Sydney and Beatrice Webb (Longmans, 1911).
The Poor Law Enigma, by M. F. Robinson (Murray, 1911).
Poor Law Reform, by J. W. Hills and M. Woods (West Strand Publishing Co., 1912).
The Devoted Work of the Guardians, by W. G. Lewis (Central Committee of Poor Law Conferences, 1918).
Some Recent Development of Poor Relief, by W. A. Bailward (King, 1914, 6d.).
The Amazing Philanthropists, by S. R. Day (Sidgwick & Jackson, 1916). By an Irish P.L.G.
In the Workhouse, by M. Wynn Nevinson (International Suffrage Bookshop, 1911), by a London P.L.G.
The Eugenics Review for November, 1910.

SHOULD ALL PATENTS BE ABOLISHED ?

YES

1. A poor man rarely receives much benefit from a patent, for he has not the capital necessary to make the patent useful, and so has to sell it usually to a body of capitalists, who reap all the profit.

2. Patents directly assist in building up monopolies, which become more and more oppressive to the people. Several of the large American trusts are greatly aided in maintaining their position by the fact that they have secured the exclusive privileges of valuable patents.

3. If the patent laws were repealed, then some more efficient means of rewarding inventors could be found ; some honour might be conferred upon them or a sum of money proportioned to the value of their inventions.

4. Large companies of capitalists sometimes obtain the control of new inventions with a view of suppressing them so as to save the expense of adapting existing machinery or buying new machinery. In this way self-interest has often held back progress through the operation of the patent laws.

5. Every invention ought to be used for the good of all, and not exploited for the good of a body of shareholders, as at present.

NO

1. Patents are the only encouragement which men of inventive faculty have for the exercise of their talent. No one would take the necessary trouble to invent a new thing

unless he were thus assured of some reward. A most useful class of men would be discouraged if the patent laws were abolished.

2. It is but right that those who by their capital actually bring the patent to bear upon life should be rewarded by a good profit. The original idea is the inventor's property, but if he sells it he has no cause of complaint if a company make a large profit out of it.

3. It would be almost impossible to find another means of rewarding the inventor, because the value of a patent is impossible to estimate before its utility has been actually tested.

4. Every law is open to some abuse, and there is no doubt the patent laws might be amended with advantage ; but if they were repealed the result would be a serious loss to the whole nation.

5. Under the present system the company is the means whereby the invention is made available by all : if it were not for the company the inventor could seldom carry out his idea.

REFERENCES :—

The Law and Practice relating to Patents, by Thos. Terrell (Sweet & Maxwell, 1909).

Patent Law and Practice, by R. Frost (Stevens, 1912).

The Patents Act (Moulton & Roberts, 1907) ; and *On Patents* (Butterworth, 1913), by Fletcher Moulton. *Monopolies by Patents* (Stevens, 1897) ; and *The Statute Law relating to Patents* (Jordan, 1908), by J. W. Gordon.

Patent Rights, by A. P. Sinnett.

The Future of Work, by Leo Chiozza Money ; chap. iii., " Capital and Ideas " (Fisher Unwin), 1914.

Industrial Democracy, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb ; Part iii., chap. ii., " The Higgling of the Market " (Longmans, 1902).

Socialism and Superior Brains, by G. Bernard Shaw (Fifield, 1910).

Articles : " Patent Law Reform," by J. W. Gordon (*Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, March 12, 1915). " Our Patent Laws," by " Temple, Junior " (*Pall Mall Gazette*, Dec. 14, 16 and 17, 1915)

HAS SURVIVAL AFTER DEATH BEEN PROVED BY MODERN SPIRITUALISM ?

YES

1. From the earliest dawn of history right up to the present day psychic phenomena have persisted : it is only the way in which they have been regarded which has changed. At first they were an essential part of primitive religion, being mysteries presided over and produced by the priests or medicine men. In the early Christian Church they also had their recognized place, for the " miracles " of the New Testament are really psychic phenomena, as well as " the gift of tongues," of prophecy, the stigmata and visions of the early saints, and the like. In the middle ages the Church tried to reserve this whole class of phenomena to itself, and we see the persecution of so-called witches and wizards. Then science chased all these facts from the field as mere superstition. The facts, however, have persisted even in spite of the dogmatism of science, until at last in present days these phenomena are being examined scientifically, with the result that the occurrence of these phenomena can no longer be denied and the only controversy is as to their interpretation and explanation.

2. Even if we dismiss all the earlier manifestations as not evidential, because they occurred in times of superstition when the rules of exact verification were not yet

known, still there remains in modern times a vast mass of facts which in their aggregate cannot be dismissed, and which cannot be covered by any other explanation than that discarnate intelligences, in spite of almost insuperable difficulties, are actually trying to communicate with us.

3. In the early days of "The Psychical Research Society" when the facts of telepathy were published they were greeted with blind incredulity and ignorant, fanatical denial: now we see a most instructive change of front—for behold, telepathy is now conceded, while the new facts pointing to real messages from the dead are denied with the old unthinking bigotry or explained by telepathy, the very thing which was formerly denied. These denials are of no consequence, for nearly everything has at one time been denied, yes, even that the earth is round.

4. Theology, ever since it began its labours of Sisyphus, has been trying to establish the immortality of the soul, with the net result that the modern world is in the main materialistic and agnostic. It might be naturally supposed that theology would welcome the prospect of finding demonstrable proof of immortality: but no, the new movement is opposed by the very people whose central doctrine it wants to prove! They even attribute the phenomena to the "devil!" Are phylacteries the only really important matters in their eyes?

5. Science has committed itself to a materialistic view. This dogmatism is just as bad as the theological dogmatism which science condemns. Science will cease to be worthy of the name unless it retains its open mind, its readiness to investigate new facts and to adjust its conclusions in accordance with them. Psychical phenomena point straight to the conclusion that survival after death is true; it is the function of science to investigate impartially. *A priori* denial or cheap sneers are merely contemptible.

6. Mediums have undoubtedly a deplorable tendency to indulge in frauds, mystifications and tricks, and this has arisen because investigation of psychic phenomena has too often been left to superstitious people who were not qualified to judge. The only facts brought forward as evidence now, however, have occurred in séances conducted under test conditions of such a rigorous character that all possibility of fraud is excluded, or at least made so difficult an explanation as to be the least likely one. There are many mediums such as Mrs. Pipers and Mrs. Verrall who are above suspicion of trickery. In fact the best phenomena occur when the medium is not paid and has no financial interest in producing results. Eminent scientists and men of letters have imposed every possible test. To suppose that Sir William Crookes, Sir Oliver Lodge, Professor Lombroso, Camille Flammarion, Sir A. Conan Doyle, to mention only a few, could all be deceived by conjuring tricks is to abandon all confidence in human testimony. As Prof. Charles Richet says: "How could I suppose that the savant who has discovered thallium and the radiometer, and foreshadowed the Roentgen rays, could commit gross and inexplicable blunders, and allow himself to be duped for years by tricks which a child could have exposed."

7. Telepathy, mind-reading or subconscious memory are insufficient to explain all the facts. "Cross-correspondence" (see literature of subject for explanation), half messages given by one medium and completed by another, facts mentioned which could not be known either to medium or to sitters and afterwards verified, predictions subsequently verified and evidences of identity quite unexpected but conclusive in character, and other frequent phenomena can be covered by only one hypothesis, namely, that the dead survive. All other hypotheses are either unlikely in themselves (sometimes indeed phantastic) or have to be

strained beyond reason to accommodate the unyielding facts of the case.

NO

1. No credence can be given to the so-called "phenomena" of modern spiritualism, because they are *a priori* impossible, in that they are at variance with the laws of nature, ascertained and established by modern physical science. What is the use of the wonderful advances made by physical science in the last hundred years if we are now to entertain theories founded upon ancient superstitions which are in open antagonism to the results so painfully achieved?

2. Though the old crude ideas of a personal devil have had to give way to more philosophical conceptions of the causes of evil—nevertheless no one denies that there are malevolent forces which manifest themselves especially on what is called the "borderland." The "phenomena" of modern spiritualism are attributable to these malevolent forces, and, so far from furnishing any "proof" of spiritualism, they should more correctly be regarded as mischievous will-o'-the-wisps and even malevolent deceptions.

3. So many mediums have been caught in tricks and deceptions that no credence can be attached to "phenomena" produced even under test conditions. The fact, also, that these "phenomena" can only be well produced in the dark throws them open from the start to well-founded suspicion. None of them are beyond the skill of a first-class modern conjuror.

4. Even granting that the phenomena are in some cases genuine, the conclusion could not be drawn that they prove survival. Resort should not be had to this tremendous conclusion until every other possible explanation has been tried and exhausted. Most of the phenomena of

modern spiritualism can readily be explained by thought transference, and even the alleged "materializations" may be susceptible to other explanations, such as the ingenious one advanced by M. Paul Joire, which may be summarized briefly as follows :—

(Remarkable experiments in the photography of thought lead to the supposition (borne out also by the phenomena of thought transference) that "thoughts are things,"—that is to say, that whenever we think, we create something which persists, although, of course, invisible. Is it not possible, then, that when a whole circle of well-educated people (assisted by a medium in a trance) concentrate their thoughts upon an expected apparition, they should succeed in some exceptional cases in imparting to their combined mental creation a certain substance which is sufficient for visibility? However difficult this theory may seem, it at least demonstrates the possibility of another explanation for the alleged phenomena, which is certainly not more difficult than the explanation of survival.

5. If these so-called "messages" from the dead were genuine, one would naturally expect some highly interesting revelations of the conditions of after-life existence. As a matter of fact, however, the messages reported are mostly trivial, reminiscent of the "spirit's" past life in the body. The few messages in which any attempt is made to explain after-death conditions are most unsatisfactory, and almost certainly arise from the crude notions on the subject which the medium has acquired from her own reading.

6. The exceeding rarity of phenomena which seem to require the hypothesis of survival should make us very cautious in resorting to it, because if it were true that spirits of the dead could communicate, they would do so much more often. There are so many occasions in life

on which the spirits might communicate with great advantage, but they avail themselves of so very few.

7. It may be granted that the soul exists as an independent entity, that it has powers as yet unknown to science, and even that it can act at a distance without intervention of the senses. These admissions would account for many of the phenomena. The residual facts still awaiting explanation are quite insufficient to prove survival.

REFERENCES :—

Mysterious Psychic Forces, by C. Flammarion (Fisher Unwin, 1907).
New Light on Immortality, by E. E. Fournier d'Albe (Longmans, 1908).

Raymond, by Sir Oliver Lodge (Methuen, 1916).

Raymond : a rejoinder, by Paul Hookham (Blackwell, 1917).

Some Revelations as to Raymond, by a Plain Citizen (Kegan Paul, 1917).

Reflections on Raymond, by Walter Cook (Grant Richards, 1917).

The Reality of Psychic Phenomena, by W. J. Crawford (Watkins, 1916).

The Question : if a man die, shall he live again ? by E. Clodd (Richards, 1918).

New Evidences in Psychical Research (Rider, 1911); *Psychical Investigations* (Cassell, 1917); and *Man is a Spirit* (Cassell, 1918), by J. Arthur Hill.

Rupert Lives ! by Walter Wynn (Kingsley Press, 1917).

The New Revelation (1918); and *The Vital Message* (1919), by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (Hodder & Stoughton).

The Dead have never Died, by E. G. Randall (Allen & Unwin, 1919).

Psychical Research and Survival, by J. H. Hyslop (Bell, 1913).

The Belief in Personal Immortality, by E. S. P. Haynes (1913).

That Other World, by Stuart Cumberland (Grant Richards, 1918).

SHOULD OUR PRISONS BE TURNED INTO REFORMATORIES ?

YES

1. That our present system of treating criminals is not really effective is plain from the statistics which show (a) that crime is steadily increasing with the population, (b) that casual criminals usually tend to become habituals under the present system, (c) that habitual criminals are not reclaimed, but are hardened and rendered sullen.

2. The idea underlying our prison system is "punishment," and this idea is radically wrong and inhuman. The true idea should be "reformation," and efforts should be directed not to the punishing of the criminal for being a bad citizen, but to the encouraging of him towards becoming a good citizen.

3. We are gradually coming to see that crime is a disease, and should be treated as such, that our prisons should become mental hospitals in which the prisoner's defective will is carefully exercised and his abnormality of mind reduced by surrounding him with healthful and sympathetic influences.

4. Prevention is better than cure, and if we were to spend upon enlightened preventive measures (*e.g.*, cheap transit to healthy neighbourhoods, education, public parks, open spaces and amusements, healthy literature, etc.) the sums we spend upon prisons, we should discover that the necessity for these prisons would decrease.

5. We make no distinction between the unfortunate, the mentally defective, the bodily weak, the radically vicious, and those who are only too poor to pay a fine. We mete out the same unenlightened treatment to essentially different cases.

6. Prison life only deadens, demoralizes and disgusts. Solitary confinement is simply torture under another name. Prisons are at best unnatural places, and even when efficiently administered goodness, manhood, honesty, and even repentance are impossible within them, for moral qualities must be free or they will die.

NO—

1. Though imprisonment may not be as effective a means of dealing with crime as could be desired, yet it is the only method which has been found practicable to secure the safety of society, and it would therefore be highly dangerous to try experiments which might give a fatal encouragement to crime.

2. The reason why we imprison a criminal is because he is dangerous to society—attempts at reformation have not been attended with encouraging results.

3. Crime is a vicious perversion of the will. If it is once allowed that crime is a disease, then moral responsibility is weakened, and the criminal begins to feel that he cannot help himself, and therefore ceases to make an effort towards the reform of his life.

4. Preventive measures should be adopted, but that does not mean that there should be any relaxation of our means of cure. As long as human nature lasts, education can never really take the place of prisons, which must always remain as a terror to the evil-doer.

5. The different classes of offenders are far more numerous than those mentioned : in fact it might be maintained that

almost every case is different from every other. Without some uniformity prison administration would be practically impossible. Our present system is an enlightened one and is constantly being improved. It is undoubtedly deterrent and that is the main thing, while it is not unnecessarily cruel.

6. We are now erring on the side of leniency and are doing too little to discourage the habitual criminal. If we turn our prisons into sanatoriums and rest-cures, we shall see crowds of lazy and vicious persons committing crimes in order to get into them.

REFERENCES :—

The Modern Prison Curriculum (Macmillan, 1912), and *Crime and Criminals* (Longmans, 1910), by R. F. Quinton (formerly Governor of Holloway Prison).—

Psychology and Crime (Dent, 1912), by Thomas Holmes.

Prisons and Prisoners, by Lady Constance Lytton (Heinemann, 1914).

Prisons, Police, and Punishment, by Edward Carpenter (Fifield, 1905).

Justice, play by John Galsworthy (Duckworth, 1910).

Our Prison System, by Alec Cook (Drane, 1914).

- *Articles* : "The Next Step in Prison Reform," by R. Barry (*The Century*, Mar. 1914). "The Rights of Criminals," by S. G. Smith (*Inter-Journal of Ethics*, Oct. 1915). "The Church and Prison Reform," by J. W. Horsley (*Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1915). "Prisons and the War," by Thomas Holmes (*Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1916). "The Borstal System and the Colonies," by B. V. Shaw (*United Empire Magazine*, Sept. 1916).

Various pamphlets are published by the Howard Association, the Penal Reform League, and the Humanitarian League.

IS PROFIT-SHARING THE CURE FOR LABOUR TROUBLES ?

YES

1. This is the most equitable way of remunerating the three industrial agents, capitalist, employer, and employed, and gives satisfaction to all.

2. Under the profit-sharing system the product of any given industry tends to increase. The reason of this is that when the employé has a personal interest in the success of the undertaking he becomes diligent, and ceases to aim at a minimum of work. Partners work together for the good of a business in a quite different manner from employés. What we want is so far as is possible to make the workmen partners. Lord Leverhulme has tried this experiment and made a great success of the enterprise.

3. Under this system the quality of the work is raised : the workmen of the famous " Maison Leclaire " had a high reputation for skill.

4. A great waste is caused in every industry by careless use of implements and machines, but when the profit-sharing scheme is adopted, it is found that the workmen take much greater care of the implements entrusted to them, and the result is a great saving, which, in itself, goes a long way to pay the bonus to the men.

5. It secures industrial peace, for both the workmen and the owners are satisfied with the results achieved.

NO

1. It is not a practicable scheme now, because the tendency is for firms to enter into combination, and any firm not doing so suffers. It is only applicable, therefore, to the monopolies and the largest firms.

2. In the large majority of instances in which it has been tried, it has failed, and even the enthusiasts have been sadly disappointed.

3. Employés see that the scheme does not go to the root of the problem, and is only an unsatisfactory make-shift.

4. Workmen know that if any bonus is paid to them, it is only made possible by their own harder labour, and moreover that the bonus is only a part of the product of this increased labour, for the employer and capitalist get the lion's share first. The bonus bears no proportion to the wages, and is a small and delusive gain.

5. An industrial problem of ever-increasing magnitude and complexity is developing itself all the world over, and the coming crisis has not been, and cannot be, stayed by any such scheme as profit-sharing, which is good in name, but practically works out but little benefit to the workman. For the small benefit he receives, the workman has to sacrifice his right of striking, and thereby throws away his strongest industrial weapon.

REFERENCES :—

Addresses on Co-partnership, by Lord Leverhulme (Lever, Bros., 1912).

The Division of the Product of Industry, by A. L. Bowley (Oxford University Press, 1919).

Profit-sharing (Macmillan, 1889), and *Methods of Industrial Peace* (Macmillan, 1904), by N. P. Gilman.

Self-Government in Industry, by G. D. H. Cole (Bell, 1917).

Guilds and the Social Crisis, by A. J. Penty (Allen & Unwin, 1919).

The Way to Industrial Peace, by B. Seebohm Rowntree ; chap vii. (Fisher Unwin, 1914).

The Meaning of National Guilds, by C. E. Bechhoffer and M. P. Reckitt (Cecil Palmer and Hayward, 1918).

Strikes and Social Problems, chaps. iii. and vii., by J. Shield Nicholson (Black, 1896).

National Guilds (Bell, 1914) ; and *An Alphabet of Economics* (Fisher Unwin, 1917), by A. R. Orage.

Article : " Co-partnership and Labour Unrest," by Neville Priestley (*Nineteenth Century*, May, 1918).

ARE BETTING AND GAMBLING NATIONAL EVILS ?

YES

1. By a bet we commonly understand a money-wager which is staked or pledged on the issue of some future event or contest. Gambling means the playing of games for money or some other valuable stake. In both cases, the essential point is that property is risked, and gained or lost, as the result of chance. Such a transference is essentially irrational, and is degrading both to intelligence and to character.

2. The fascination of betting and gambling lies in the hope which they hold out of winning money without working for it. In other words they appeal to avarice and to sloth—two of the basest passions of human nature.

3. The demoralizing effects of this vice are evident from the fact that no business man would knowingly offer a position of trust to a gambler, while bookmakers are despised even by those who deal with them, and the betting ring on a race-course is haunted by the dregs of society.

4. The social dangers of betting and gambling are recognized by the laws with which civilized nations have endeavoured—more or less ineffectively—to restrain and prohibit these practices, at least in public.

5. The growth of gambling in England has become a national peril. Sport is being ruined, when not only horse

racers but football, cricket, and every form of athletics are turned into an opportunity and excuse for making bets. While, especially since the introduction of "Bridge," gambling at clubs and in private houses has risen to a pitch which recalls the traditions of the eighteenth century. Even women, the poor as well as the rich, are infected with this passion. Titled ladies bet at Newmarket, and Lancashire factory girls take odds from a bookmaker on horses they have never seen.

6. In all kinds of wholesale trade the mania for speculation has increased, until only a small proportion of the total business done can be described as "legitimate." The bulk of the transactions recorded, however they may be disguised, are merely so much betting on the fluctuations of the market. Hence we have "panics on change," commercial crises, "corners" in wheat or in cotton, and other symptoms of business decadence.

7. Many evening newspapers exist mainly on the strength of the gambling news which they supply in such detail. In fact the passion for gambling is so widely spread that we can only describe it as a national evil.

8. Experience proves that a confirmed passion for gambling is one of the most difficult of all vices to cure. It must be compared, not to the craving for alcohol, but to the craving for opium.

9. In the face of facts like these, it becomes a paramount necessity for Parliament to find some means of counteracting these serious national evils.

NO

1. It is a fallacy to argue that everything which is "irrational,"—*i.e.* into which reason does not actively enter—must therefore be degrading. We find recreation, interest and healthy excitement in many ways, which though not

very philosophical, are quite innocent and wholesome. To bet a pair of gloves on the University Boat Race, and to play at cards for halfpence at a Christmas party, are amusements which it is absurd to brand as "immoral." We should beware of creating "artificial vices."

2. It is a fallacy to argue that when two men bet, the winner takes money from the loser without giving him anything in return. The essence of a bet is, that two men agree to give one another the pleasurable excitement and expectation of winning. This is what they enjoy—not the mere money at stake, which is often of no real importance to either of them—and this is what the loser has his share in, just as much as the winner.

3. It is easy to point to abuses and excesses in any department of human life. But just as the sots in the tap-room do not make it wicked to drink a glass of beer, so the touts on a race-course do not make it wicked to play whist for small stakes. Most Bridge players agree that the game is insipid unless some trifling sum is staked on it.

4. The complexity of modern commerce makes it impossible for a merchant to transact extensive business without some amount of speculative dealing in "futures." But this kind of business, when conducted in a legitimate manner so as to cover risks, really steadies the market and acts as a protection against those "cornering" operations which are correctly described as gambling on a great scale. Against this latter kind of gambling many legal remedies have been suggested, but none of them appear effectual.

5. The business of a newspaper is not to act as a censor, but to supply news; it rests with its readers to make such use of the news as they think best. But the editor who prints odds is not responsible for gambling—any more than the railway company which runs excursion trains to a race-meeting.

6. If working men bet and gamble in excess, this is from a desire for some excitement to relieve the monotony of their lives, and the real remedy lies in improving the conditions under which they labour, and the homes in which they dwell.

7. While it is distinctly dishonest for any person to risk the loss of a sum which he cannot afford to pay, the immorality of small bets or of playing cards for small stakes has yet to be demonstrated.

8. Gambling, like many other things, is only harmful when practised by people who lack self-control. It may well become an individual evil: it certainly is not a national one.

9. We have quite enough legislation on this subject and its impracticability is best seen in the many and various difficulties and contentions in which our police get involved in their efforts to prevent violations of our betting and gambling laws.

REFERENCES :—

- The Ethics of Gambling*, by W. Douglas McKenzie (Melrose, 1911).
Betting and Gambling: a National Evil, by B. Seebohm Rowntree (Macmillan, 1905).
Working Men and Gambling, by Will Crooks (Social Ideals Series, 1909).
Tattersall's Rules on Betting (Cox, 1888), and *The Law Relating to Betting* (Waterlow, 1892), by G. H. Stutfield.
Facts and Figures for the Anti-Gambling Campaign, by Henry Carter (Methodist Publishing House, 1907).
The Stock Exchange, by F. W. Hirst (Home University Library).
Chance and Luck, by R. A. Proctor (Longmans, 1887).
Ten Days at Monte Carlo at the Bank's Expense (1898); and *Monte Carlo Anecdotes and Systems of Play*, by V. B. (Victor Bethell) (Heinemann).
The Gambler, novel, by Katherine Cecil Thurston.

SHOULD WE ADOPT PROPORTIONAL — REPRESENTATION ?

NOTE.—“ An essential feature of any proportional scheme is the creation of constituencies returning several members. . . . In each of these enlarged constituencies a voter would have a single transferable vote. He would vote by putting the figure 1 against the name of his favourite . . . and he would proceed to mark additional preferences by putting the figures 2, 3, 4, 5, etc., against the names of as many or as few of the other candidates as he wished . . . With the enlarged areas this system gives representation to the different groups of citizens in proportion to their strength.”— (See Representation, No. 33, March, 1919).

YES

1. “ The methods of election adopted in the early stages of representative institutions fail to respond to the need of the more complex political conditions of highly civilized communities ” (J. H. Humphreys). Exclusive majority representation exaggerates the majority and often totally suppresses the minority. When more than two parties are competing the whole majority system breaks down. Now P.R. (Proportional Representation) secures that each party shall be represented in Parliament in proportion to its strength in the country. Thus under the present system Birmingham returns 7 Unionists, because this party is in the majority in each constituency, but under P.R. if the electors were divided as follows, Unionists 40,000, Liberals 20,000, Labour 10,000, then the representation would be

4 Unionists, 2 Liberals and 1 Labour. This would be manifestly a juster representation.

2. Under the majority system all votes for unsuccessful candidates are without any effect, while under P.R. almost every single vote has its due influence on the election, because both the superfluous votes of the successful candidates and the unused votes of the candidates who fail are distributed according to their second, third or fourth choices as far as necessary to secure the election of the requisite number of representatives.

3. The Royal Commission on Electoral Systems decided that the three systems of P.R. submitted to them were quite feasible. Voting would no doubt be more complicated, but the elector would be intelligent enough to carry it out. It is not necessary that the electoral system should be adapted to the least intelligent members of the community. Any one can understand the principle by which men are voted for on a list in the order of preference for them. Returning officers have no fear that they would not be equal to the difficulties of P.R. The delay in publishing election results would be only slight. The Royal Commission said, "On the whole it is probably safe to say that in a constituency where 60,000 or 70,000 votes are cast, such as would have to be contemplated in this country, the results should be declared with efficient arrangements in the course of the second day after the poll."

4. P.R. would not encourage faddists and small sectional interests, for in such a constituency as Liverpool, for instance, a sectional interest would have to obtain as many as 10,000 votes before it could be represented. It is unlikely that any narrow interest could obtain the requisite votes. P.R. reduces sectional interests to their true proportions. Under the present system candidates have often to pledge themselves to small sections who happen to hold the balance

of votes, and while these small sections often have excessive power huge bodies of electors, such as the minority of Unionists in Scotland, have really no voice or representation in Parliament at all.

5. P.R. would make the relation between member and constituency more satisfactory and enduring than at present. Under majority elections members have often to seek new constituencies because they cannot obtain a majority in the old one ; thus Gladstone had to leave Greenwich for Mid-Lothian. Under P.R. a man with local ties might be elected even though he could not obtain a majority of votes, while an eminent politician will probably be able to maintain his connection with the same electorate,

6. P.R. has been a success in Denmark, Belgium, Sweden S. Africa and in all other countries where it has been given a fair trial. It is also less costly than the present system which gives an undue advantage to the member with a long purse. "All this cultivating and working, all this going about and making things right with this little jobber here, that contractor there, all the squaring of small political clubs and organizations, all the subscription blackmail and charity robbery, that now makes a parliamentary candidature so utterly rotten an influence on public life, will be killed by P.R."—*H. G. Wells*.

NO

1. P.R. "cannot be recommended in a political election where the question which party is to govern the country plays a predominant part." Our whole system of party politics has been of slow growth and has on the whole been very effective. P.R. would threaten the stability of this well-tried system and would therefore be a dangerous experiment.

2. P.R. is far too complicated. The electors would

not understand it, with the result that a large proportion of the voting papers would be spoiled. What is the good of having manhood suffrage if you have an intricate method of voting which requires special study before it can be understood? The task of the returning officials would be most intricate and mistakes in the calculations would be frequent.

3. P.R. advocates have to put forth so much effort to show that their scheme is feasible that they do not pause to raise the question, Is it desirable? The delay alone in publishing the election results is a most objectionable feature.

4. P.R. would send a most embarrassing number of faddists and cranks to Parliament. Prof. Edward Jenks says, "If we had such a vast constituency as Manchester or Liverpool under the proportional system we should certainly have a member for teetotalism, a member for vegetarianism and the like, and each of these, in all probability, would be instructed rigidly to oppose everything inconsistent with the special ideal of its constituents."

5. P.R. would destroy the present intimate relationship between a member of Parliament and his constituency. Only local candidates would have a chance and eminent politicians would not be elected to Parliament, to the great national loss. Parliament would be an assembly of little men full of local interests.

6. P.R. elections would be much more costly. They would also lose interest for the voter. What the British public wants is a good straight fight between two parties fought to a finish.

REFERENCES :—

- Report of the Royal Commission on Electoral Systems, 1910.*
Treatise on the Election of Representatives, by Thos Hare (Longmans, 1861).

- Representative Government*, by John Stuart Mill (Dent, 1861).
Parliamentary Government, by Earl Grey (1864).
Representation, by Lord Avebury (Sonnenschein, 1885).
Proportional Representation, by John R. Commons (Macmillan, 1907).
Electoral Reform, by Joseph King (Fisher Unwin, 1908).
Proportional Representation, by John R. Humphreys (Methuen, 1911).
Our Electoral System, by Joseph King and F. W. Raffety, chap. v. (Murby, 1912).
The Reform of Political Representation, by J. Fischer Williams (Murray, 1918).
In the Fourth Year, by H. G. Wells (Chatto & Windus, 1918).
Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, chiefly of 1917 and 1918.
The Proportional Representation Society publishes many pamphlets.
Article : "Proportional Representation," by Lord Parmoor (*Contemporary Review*, Nov. 1917).

IS THE PULPIT LOSING ITS POWER ?

YES

1. In the early centuries preaching owed its phenomenal success to the novelty of the message it gave ; but now Christianity has become so worked into our manner of thinking that preaching is only the ingenious repeating over and over again of certain well-worn formulæ.

2. Until comparatively recent times the pulpit held its influence on account of the ignorance of the mass of the people, who consequently went to church to be taught ; but now education has so spread that often the preacher is not so well informed as his hearers, with the natural result that this function of the pulpit is passing away.

3. It may be urged that ignorant fishermen at first converted the world, but those who urge this forget that they did so, not in virtue of their ignorance, but through the agency of alleged miracles, which cannot be performed by modern preachers. It is forgotten, also, that the spread of Christianity was more due to the educated Apostle Paul than to the fishermen.

4. Everything which the preacher says has "to be calculated to the meridian " of the creed of his church. These creeds are now sadly out of date and the real opinion of the preacher is mostly far in advance of them. There is thus a well-founded suspicion that the preacher does not and dare not say what he thinks. Where there is a

lack of conviction, as well as a lack of common honesty in statement, there can be no power.

5. Custom has made the functions of the pulpit so mechanical that there is very little real life and variety in sermons. Originality is crushed under the weight of conventional views.

6. People feel that they are hearing only one side of a question from the pulpit, for there is no real debate, and opposing views are not fairly stated. No wonder that preaching has already become formal, and is losing its influence.

7. The very conditions of the modern preacher's life secure that his preaching can have but little real influence. He lives so much in the public eye and his life is so exactly like that of other men that he dare not boldly denounce prevailing evils for fear of a *tu quoque*; it is plain, on the other hand, that the ancient preachers were influential largely on account of their bold denouncing of evil, having no fear of this *tu quoque*, because their lives seemed manifestly devoted and essentially different from other men's.

8. Taking the average of modern preaching, there is a want of ability, conviction, culture and training, which makes its decay inevitable.

9. There are so many conflicting interests in a modern congregation that preaching, not to give offence, has to be nearly colourless. This restraint of warmth and zeal and genuine belief by prudential considerations is the death of modern preaching.

NO

1. Christianity appeals to the radical needs of men, which are ever the same, and earnest preaching can never become out of date, because men must always have some eternal truth to live upon.

2. The teaching function of the pulpit has by no means passed away, for there are always changes in our theological views, developments of Christianity, adaptations of Christianity to present-day conditions which make efficient preaching one of the most urgent needs of our day.

3. The intellectual standing of the clergy is no test of the influence of the pulpit, for Christianity owed its original successes to the efforts of uneducated fishermen. As long as there is any zeal left in the church, the influence of the pulpit cannot decay.

4. A church must have some standard of doctrine to prevent mere irresponsible private opinion being preached officially. Sufficient latitude is accorded, however, to the individuality of the preacher to enable him to use any special power he may possess. Any lack of conviction or of honesty merely demonstrates the unsuitability of the particular preacher. Good preaching is not losing its power merely because many individual preachers never had any.

5. Wherever a preacher has the strength of mind to be himself and fearlessly preach his message, then the people fill his church, showing that the tyranny of custom is not such as effectively to prevent originality, but rather that the conditions of modern life encourage it.

6. Mere controversial preaching is fortunately passing out of fashion, but preaching that deals directly with the heart and life never fails to attract men. This preaching has nothing to do with controversy, but deals with the love of God and the duty we owe to our neighbour.

7. Really influential preaching cannot come from any but a very sincere and good man, and this is well. Wherever such a man is found in the pulpit, his preaching is full of influence. In ancient times great fraud and hypocrisy were possible because often the reputed monastic saint

could ill afford to have his private life examined as are the private lives of the modern clergy.

8. Ancient preachers often attained their power by the aid of countless superstitions which have now passed away, and consequently, though the outward effect of modern preaching may seem to be less, yet the real moral and spiritual influence is greater, because it has shaken itself free from superstition and hypocrisy.

9. Colourless preaching empties a church, and preachers are driven by the force of competition to make their message interesting and attractive.

REFERENCES :—

- Conventional Lies of our Civilization*, by Max Nordau (Heinemann).
The Churches at the Crossroads, by J. H. Shakespeare (Williams & Norgate, 1918).
The Time Spirit, by R. Dimsdale Stocker (Erskine McDonald, 1913).
Rough Talks by a Padre, by G. A. Studdert-Kennedy (Hodder & Stoughton, 1918).
The Bankruptcy of Religion (1917); and *The Church and the People* (1919), by Joseph McCabe (Watts & Co.).
The Church of England: its Nature and its Future: a symposium (University of London Press, 1919).
Life and Labour in London, Third Series; *Religious Influences*, by Charles Booth (Macmillan, 1903).
The Heart of the Empire: a symposium; Sections i. and vii. (Fisher Unwin, 1901).
The Church in the Commonwealth, by R. Roberts (New Commonwealth Books, 1917).
 Articles: "Is the Church losing its Power?" by W. P. Paterson (*Constructive Quarterly*, Oxford, Dec. 1916). "The Real Basis of Democracy," by Edmond Holmes (*Nineteenth Century*, Aug. 1917). "Democracy and Religion," by Rev. R. G. Parsons (*Contemporary Review*, Sept. 1918).

SHOULD ESPERANTO BE ADOPTED AS THE INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE ?

NO

1. Why should we invent a new language ? Are there not enough in the world already ? Latin is probably too difficult, but why not make either English or French the international language ?

2. Languages are not made, they grow. An artificial language is a monstrosity, interesting only to extreme faddists.

3. The experience we have had with international languages is not promising. Volapük was very successful for a time, and then disappeared off the face of the earth, leaving to those who had learned it the irritating conclusion that they had taken all the trouble for nothing. This may well be the fate of Esperanto, and who would risk it ?

4. Esperanto is far from being an ideal artificial language. The "j's" are very ugly, that "c" is sounded like "ts" is difficult, and there are too many roots taken from other languages than English. If a better language should be invented, then those who had learned Esperanto would have wasted their time.

5. There is no mental training so good as the study of modern languages. Nothing widens the mental horizon so much, nothing broadens the sympathies so effectively.

If Esperanto were to become the international language this study would be severely discouraged to the serious intellectual loss of the world.

6. Even if Esperanto were suitable to Europeans, Orientals could never learn it. It is better to wait until we have an artificial language which is as perfect as it can be made and suitable for the whole world.

7. Esperanto should not be adopted as the international language because it would weaken patriotism and develop a bloodless cosmopolitanism, it would rapidly split up into mutually unintelligible dialects, pronunciation would vary so much that one nation would fail to understand the Esperanto of another, you must know three or four languages properly to understand Esperanto; and finally because it will not come into general use in our day.

YES

1. It is practically and politically impossible to make any existing language into an international one; practically impossible, because each language has certain peculiarities of grammar, idiom and pronunciation which make it very difficult for foreigners to acquire it thoroughly, and politically impossible, because all other nations would unite in preventing any particular nation from enjoying the enormous prestige the adoption of its language as international would give it. No, an international language must be artificial and Esperanto is the most suitable, because its roots are taken from the most widely spoken European languages while all the special difficulties of each are avoided in its perfectly regular grammar, idiom and pronunciation.

2. An international language is not a fad, but a necessity: for the intellectual world, in order to facilitate reference to important works written in foreign languages, which

can be very exactly translated into Esperanto: for the commercial world, to facilitate international business correspondence, and for practical, everyday life as a ready means of conversing with foreigners.

3. Volapük failed because attempts were made to improve it, which had the effect of splitting it up into various "idioms." This danger has been most carefully avoided in the "Constitution" of Esperanto adopted at Boulogne, by making the little work "Fundamento de Esperanto" the foundation of the language "in which no one has the right to make any change." An artificial language to be of any use must be unalterable. Esperanto is such a language and has therefore a prospect of success sufficiently certain to more than justify the slight labour of learning it.

4. The Esperanto "j" is simply equivalent to the English "y," while the sound "ts" for "c" has been adopted for very sound reasons (too long to detail here). It is not claimed that Esperanto is the best possible international language, but it is so well constructed and melodious (resembling Italian in this respect) that its general adoption as a secondary language would practically solve all the present difficulties of the multi-lingual problem.

5. Esperanto is a "type-tongue," and so far from discouraging the study of other languages, it would rather assist in this cultural work. The Esperanto roots are chosen from those common to the most of the most widely spoken modern languages, so that those who know Esperanto would acquire these languages most easily, and those who know these languages will learn Esperanto most readily.

6. All foundation is removed from this argument by the fact that Esperanto has made great progress in Japan and China. At present the intelligent Oriental is faced with the necessity of learning three or four European languages: how much simpler it would be if he could solve his difficulties

by learning one only—Esperanto, which is really a sort of extract of the chief European tongues.

7. The result of the excessive nationalism of the past has been a series of devastating wars; anything which encourages a better mutual understanding among the nations would be a blessing. Esperanto would not split up into dialects so long as its present basic principles were adhered to. It is so skilfully constructed that all the special pronunciation difficulties of each language are avoided and only those sounds are admitted which present no difficulty to any European. Esperantists do as a matter of fact understand each other perfectly, as has been sufficiently proved at the various international Congresses which have been held. Whether it will be adopted in our day or not depends upon us. If Esperanto forms part of the great reconstruction necessary after the world war, the ideal of the "United States of Europe" will be brought much nearer and the still greater ideal of "The Federation of Mankind" will come in sight. Mutual understanding is the first step towards mutual agreement.

REFERENCES:—

International Language, by W. J. Clark (Dent, 1907).

An International Language (Stead Publishing House).

Articles: A series appeared in *English*, March to June, 1919. A series appeared in *The Socialist Review*, Nos. 78, 79, 80, and 89 (Nov. and Dec. 1916; Jan. and Sept. 1917). *The Future*, (Sept. 1917, and July, 1918).

The British Esperanto Association, 17, Hart Street, London, W.C.1, can supply all the literature of the language.

SHOULD THE REFERENDUM BE INTRODUCED INTO ENGLISH POLITICS ?

YES

1. Real local representation is an impossibility, because there are so many conflicting interests and views in any given locality, that any majority is usually found to indicate the trend of feeling on only one or two points which were made prominent in the election, while if other points had been made prominent, the majority would have been on the other side. Thus large sections of the community are wholly unrepresented. Representation of the various classes in the community, or of the different schools of thought, would be much fairer, but direct legislation by the adoption of some form of Referendum is evidently the true solution of the difficulty.

2. There are far more than two political parties in this country and all these various views are not represented. The Temperance party is inadequately represented, also the Nonconformists, the Educationists, etc., while the Medical profession and Science are not represented at all. Our present system gives disproportionate weight to the views of capitalists, landlords, military men, lawyers and State clergy.

3. It is so difficult for one man to represent another that it is plainly impossible for one man to represent a whole locality. Party pledges and election programmes do not

bind the members, who act largely according to their own private views.

4. Direct legislation is at work to-day in Switzerland, and gives every satisfaction. Direct legislation is the key to all reform, for it concentrates the attention of the people upon measures rather than upon men, and when the people want a reform, they can get it without being thwarted by the scheming of monopolists. It would represent every class of voter, and hence work directly towards social peace and contentment.

5. It could be adopted gradually, and even after it was fully at work Parliament would still be necessary for drafting bills and detail work. The Referendum is the best education of the people in self-government.

NO

1. Our representative system might be cautiously improved, but there is no necessity to go to the extreme of the Referendum.

2. Under the Referendum enlightened government would be impossible, for great issues are often not half understood by the people, and would be decided not on reasonable but upon sentimental grounds.

3. The House of Lords and the public press are sufficient safeguards against hasty legislation, and if the Referendum were introduced, the debates in Parliament would lose tone, and the mere agitator would have far too much influence.

4. Switzerland is too small to give any evidence of how such a system would work in a powerful nation. The people, with true instinct, prefer to vote for men in whom they have confidence than for measures the working of which they do not fully understand. If the legislature of the country has the interests of the people at heart, direct legislation is unnecessary; and if they have not these

interests at heart, it is impossible to pass the Referendum—therefore in the one case the proposal is needless, and in the other impossible.

5. People are best educated in self-government on the representative system, and at the same time have the advantage of many safeguards against their own rashness.

REFERENCES :—

- Representative Government*, by John Stuart Mill (Longmans).
Essays on Representative Government and Parliamentary Reform, by Herbert Spencer.
The Swiss Confederation, by F. O. Adams and C. D. Cunningham (Macmillan, 1889).
The Referendum among the English (in America), by S. R. Honey (Macmillan, 1912).
True Democracy v. Government by Faction, by F. H. B. Skrine (Longmans, 1911).
Electoral Reform, chap. ix., by Joseph King, (Fisher Unwin, 1908).
The Reform of Political Representation, by J. Fischer Williams (Murray, 1918).
Proportional Representation (chap. vii. and Appendix ix.), by John R. Commons (Macmillan, 1907).
The State, by T. Woodrow Wilson (Isbister, 1899).
The Referendum in America, by E. P. Oberholtzer (Scribners, 1900).
The American Commonwealth, by Lord Bryce (Macmillan, 1910).
 Article : " Washington's First Experience in Direct Legislation," by L. B. Shippee (*Political Science Quarterly*, June, 1915).

CAN A MAN GET RICH HONESTLY ?

YES

1. The principles upon which all commerce is founded are sound at the core, and it is only the greed and selfishness of man which pervert them ; a man can become rich by honest industry to-day as surely as he could a hundred years ago.

2. It is a fact of experience that those who pay due attention to the needs of their employés, and conduct their business according to the dictates of a high sense of honour, fare the best in the long run, however dishonest practices seem to flourish for the time.

3. Competition is a law of nature, and though a man may be compelled to supplant other men in order to become rich, he nevertheless acts with perfect fairness according to the laws he finds in operation in the world.

4. We must accept facts as they are, for no good ever came of dreaming. These facts show us that it is the fittest man who becomes rich. There can be nothing wrong, then, in a man who is fit exerting himself to " come out on top " in the struggle of life.

5. It is but right that the man who starts a new industry, or increases the productiveness of an old one, or who so organizes the labour he has at his command that the world can get certain goods cheaper than before, should enjoy large fruits of his labour. As he does more for the race

than his workman does, he should, of course, have a much higher reward. The rules of political economy, fortunately, demonstrate themselves in spite of the faddists.

6. Christianity does not condemn the wealthy, but points out to all the responsibilities attaching to their various stations in life. As a matter of fact the rich are, as a rule, far more honest in facing their responsibilities than the poor. The upright and deserving are more and more gaining the rewards of life.

NO

1. There are so many shady transactions in commerce that our sense of what is honest has become blunted. It is possible now for a man to spend his life gambling on the Stock Exchange, and to delude himself into the idea that he is perfectly honest.

2. The royal road to getting rich is to pay employes a minimum wage and extort from them a maximum amount of work. The less scruple a man has in this respect, the more certain is he of becoming rich.

3. The law of competition is a cruel, modern superstition under which good men and true are driven to the wall in order that men who have hardened their hearts may succeed.

4. It is not the fittest who survive, but those who have exceptional opportunities, and those who are not too scrupulous. If a man possesses any extraordinary wealth to-day, it may be taken for granted (for so close are the relations of society) that a large number of his fellow-men have to suffer for it, both those whom he has cut out and those whom he oppresses.

5. The wealth of the world has become fabulous, yet happiness does not increase with it. The relations of life are becoming more and more marked by suspicion, hatred

and discontent ; the very wealthy are not happy, because they feel that they have secured more than their fair share of the good things of the world, and the poor are wretched beyond expression, seeing no way of escape, and yet knowing well that all the political economy in the world cannot justify one man in possessing more money than he can throw away, while another has none at all.

6. The spirit of Christianity is utterly opposed to the idea of one man absorbing abnormal wealth. The luxury seen on every hand to-day is simply an indication that we are pagan at heart, though we profess Christianity with our lips. It is possible to become wealthy without transgressing the world's standard of honesty, but it is not possible without violating the Christian standard.

REFERENCES :—

- Commercial Gambling*, by C. W. Smith (King, 1906).
Trusts, Pools and Corners, by J. S. Jeans (Methuen, 1894).
The Distribution of Income, by Prof. William Smart (Macmillan, 1912).
Aristocracy and Evolution, by W. H. Mallock (Black, 1898).
The Rules and Usages of the Stock Exchange, by G. H. Stutfield (Effingham, Wilson & Co., 1901).
The Conduct of Life, by Lord Haldane (Fisher Unwin, 1907).
The Taxation of Capital, by A. Soward and W. E. Willan (Waterlow, 1919).
A Levy on Capital, by F. Y. Edgeworth (Oxford Univ. Press, 1919).
The Camel and the Needle's Eye, by Arthur Ponsonby (Fifield, 1910).
Riches and Poverty, by Leo Chiozza Money (Methuen, 1910).
Public Service v. Private Expenditure, by Sir Oliver Lodge (Fabian Tract).
Socialism for Millionaires, by G. Bernard Shaw (Fabian Tract, 1910).
Articles : "The Conscription of Wealth," by T. C. Taylor (*Contemporary Review*, Dec. 1917) ; and by J. A. R. Marriott (*Nineteenth Century*, Feb. 1918). "Capital and General Progress," by W. H. Mallock (*Nineteenth Century*, March, 1918).

THE LESS THE STATE MEDDLES WITH THE INDIVIDUAL THE BETTER.

AFFIRMATIVE

1. Men have attained to character and self-reliance in proportion as they have enjoyed liberty, and hence, every unnecessary extension of the functions of government, being a restriction of liberty, must thereby have a deteriorating effect upon men.

2. At no time in the history of the human race has the principle of individual liberty been carried out so thoroughly as during the last hundred years, and at no time has the general advance all along the line been more marked. We see also that in those countries which have been the most free has the advance been the most rapid and permanent—this is manifest from the condition of Great Britain and America.

3. Innumerable instances of the failure of legislatures to see the disastrous effects of their own control can be cited from the past (see *The Sins of Legislators*, by Herbert Spencer) ; but it is sufficient for us to point now to the War Office and the Admiralty to become convinced of the waste of public money occasioned by government control, and this waste, be it remembered, entails the cramping of private enterprise and checking of national prosperity.

4. The whole science of biology would teach us that competition is the force which produces progress, and if

competition is limited by government, the only effect must be degeneration.

5. Individualists are not blind to the present evils of society, but they maintain that the true way to cure them is through private enterprise; *e.g.*, that the evil of overcrowding and bad housing is best met by individuals investing their money in popular improvements which, if efficiently carried out on business principles, would certainly pay.

NEGATIVE

1. Unrestrained liberty is a barbaric ideal, and true liberty can only exist through men voluntarily submitting to restraints for the public good. It is the practical acceptance of this ideal which alone makes government possible, and according as this ideal is better realized will the functions of government increase.

2. In full accordance with this principle it appears that those countries which are most free show the greatest development of the functions of government, both municipal and parliamentary, and the greatest amount of prosperity. Careful distinction must, of course, be made between a one-man tyranny, which is the denial of liberty, and a popular government, which is the highest form of liberty.

3. All true progress is attained through mistakes, and, though the sins of legislators can be pointed to, yet wisdom has been learned by these sins, and the lesson to be read from them is not to restrict the functions of popular government, but rather to increase them; for it is plain that according as popular government is extended, so are public spirit, self-sacrifice, general intelligence and enlightenment extended, and according as popular government is restricted in its powers, so is license given to the destructive forces of selfishness, fraud, and greed.

4. This is disputed. The survival of the fittest is not necessarily the survival of the best. Herbert Spencer's arguments from biology are opposed by Professor Huxley ("Administrative Nihilism" in Vol. 1 of his *Collected Essays*—Macmillan). Society is an organism, and only by the extending of the control of the central power can harmony be reached.

5. It follows then that true liberty is secured by more extended, willing, and self-sacrificing submission for the public good, true equality by the spreading of education by government, and true fraternity by the realization of common life in popular government. This tendency is rapidly developing itself, and as it develops, the good of the majority is gradually attained.

REFERENCES :—

- The Works of Huxley, Herbert Spencer, and J. S. Mill.
Social Evolution (Macmillan, 1898) and *The Science of Power* (Methuen, 1918), by Benjamin Kidd.
The Principles of State Interference, by D. G. Ritchie (Sonnen-schein, 1902).
From Warfare to Welfare, by R. D. Stocker (Palmer & Hayward, 1916).
The Task of Social Hygiene, by Havelock Ellis (Constable, 1912).
Freedom, by Gilbert Cannan (New Commonwealth Series, 1917).
The State and the Doctor, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb (Longmans, 1910).
The Limitations of State Industrial Control: a symposium (Fisher Unwin, 1919).
The Decline of Liberty in England, by E. S. P. Haynes (Grant Richards, 1916).
The Servile State, by Hilaire Belloc (Foules, 1912).
Socialism and Individualism, by Sidney Webb, G. B. Shaw, Sidney Ball, and Sir Oliver Lodge (Fabian Society, 1908).
Articles: "The Formulas for State Action," by Arthur Roger (International Journal of Ethics, April, 1916).
A series of articles on "The War and British Liberties," by J. A. Hobson, were published in *The Nation*, April to July, 1916.

IS CHRISTIANITY MADE INEFFECTIVE BY THE DIVISIONS AMONG THE CHURCHES ?

YES

1. The second great principle of Christianity is, "Love thy neighbour as thyself," and the division of the churches is a violation of this, producing discord, competition, and uncharitableness.

2. When Christians are not only divided but bitterly opposed, the outsider has fair ground for scoffing.

3. This division leads to a waste of energy, a waste of money, and a waste of life.

4. The present divisions are a serious difficulty in the way of missionary enterprise, because the heathen mind is so confused by the different teachings of Christians as to be easily led into entire scepticism.

5. Divisions swell the ranks of the clergy, and, by making the competition between them so sharp, leads them to resort to various objectionable forms of advertising which bring discredit on the cause they advocate by reducing it to the level of a commercial undertaking.

NO

1. If Christians are to carry out the principle of "Love thy neighbour" thoroughly, it is necessary they should allow their neighbour the same freedom of thought and

conscience as they demand for themselves, and this must divide the churches.

2. The differences in thought among Christians should lead outsiders to a confidence in their sincerity, because, knowing the advantages of union, they still prefer to remain separate for the sake of their convictions.

3. Under present conditions there is a great deal more zeal in the devotion of energy, money, and life to the work of each church than there could be under any system of monotonous uniformity.

4. Division gives colour, richness, and variety to the Christian faith, and enables it to develop in different directions, "lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

5. The number of the clergy, and the consequent competition, are good, for this is a sign that a great deal of Christian work is being done, the quality of which is kept up by the competition.

REFERENCES :—

The Churches at the Crossroads, by J. H. Shakespeare (Williams & Norgate, 1918).

The Road to Unity, by H. Hensley Henson (Hodder & Stoughton, 1911).

The Outlook for Religion, by W. E. Orchard (Cassell, 1917).

Nonconformity and the Free Churches, by W. B. Selbie (Home University Library, 1912).

Catholicity, by R. Heber Newton (Putnams, 1918).

The War and Unity (lectures) : a symposium (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1919).

Towards Re-union : a symposium (Macmillan, 1919).

Articles in the Contemporary Review : "The Need of a Church Theory for Church Union," by Principal Forsyth (March, 1917) ; "Christian Re-union," by Bishop Welldon (July, 1917) ; "Re-union : the Present Outlook," by the Rev. Dr. Vernon Bartlet (Oct. 1918).

The Church Times, Jan., Feb., March, 1916, contained an exhaustive correspondence on the differences existing between the various parties within the Church of England.

SOCIALISM

NOTE.—All serious continental writers understand Socialism to mean some form of society in which all the means and instruments of production, distribution and exchange are held and used by the State.

IN FAVOUR OF SOCIALISM

1. When we look into the history of society, we see that from the beginning there has been a steady progress: at first the lowest class were slaves, then in process of time they developed into serfs, and finally they have become the modern wage-earners. There is no reason, however, to suppose that this is the end of this development; on the contrary, the lowest class is rapidly being drilled and educated preparatory to taking another step in advance, a step which must lead them from the position of being the slaves of capital to the position of being its controllers. The public control of capital for the public benefit is becoming more possible, even probable, as time advances.

2. History clearly shows the gradual rise of the *bourgeoisie*—the serfs of the middle ages became the chartered burghers of the earliest towns, and gradually, as commerce increased and markets were opened, the control of the world's capital passed into the hands of this *bourgeoisie*. Now there are many signs that the *bourgeoisie* are finding the management of all this capital too large an undertaking. That this class is failing to control its vast resources is

seen in the constant occurrence of strikes and commercial crises brought about by competitive exploitation of labour and competitive over-production. As long as the competitive system holds, the condition of labour can only become worse, and the periodic commercial crises more serious. The times are evidently becoming ripe for the great body of the people to take over the control of their own capital.

3. The policy of reaction, or *laissez-faire*, cannot prevent the issue ; the time is past, also, when mere reform of things under the present system will avail. Philanthropy and private charity have failed to cope with the intensifying evils—the reason for this being that society is outgrowing its present form ; and so acute is this feeling that men are divided into two hostile camps—the rich and the poor, capital and labour. In this antagonism and stress the most enlightened spirits of the day see the birth-pangs of a new era, when socialism shall take the place of competition.

4. Socialism does not contradict political economy, because political economy is only the statement of the consequences which must and do follow, given the basis of the present social condition. Socialism, however, lays stress on the fact that it is the present social condition which is at fault and must be altered. Clearly, then, socialism in no way contradicts political economy.

5. Already the members of the productive class are so numerous and well disciplined that half the socialistic theory is being carried out, viz., social production—and it only remains, therefore, to socialize capital. The tendency of capital now is to become massed together in ever-growing quantities, worked by huge trusts and syndicates, and soon it will only require a single step to socialize it.

6. When this takes place it will be only the carrying

out of the leading principles of Christianity, and, in fact, socialism should be considered as the natural result of so many centuries of preaching, which is at last beginning to work down into practical life. This position is illustrated by the success of Christian socialism all over the world.

7. Socialism has long passed out of the stage of mere Utopian dreaming in which it existed in the time of Owen. Now it is a reasoned theory on a scientific basis, a rationally active force impelling an irresistible development of society.

8. The extreme views on religion and on marriage put forward by some socialists are quite accidental to socialism, and form no necessary or desirable part of it.

9. Anarchy and nihilism have only arisen where it became practically impossible to achieve any ordered reform. This was clearly the case in Russia, where it was not till law-abiding efforts had been ruthlessly suppressed that nihilism appeared. True socialism has nothing in common with Bolshevism.

10. Only under socialism will it be possible for men to develop a true freedom. The present conditions of life inevitably imply an ever-increasing severity of labour for the masses in order that the privileged few may accumulate hoards of wealth. Freedom at present for the majority of men is sentimental only, but under socialism it would become practical.

11. Our present system calls forth the keenest selfishness, and a scrupulous man is at a hopeless disadvantage; but socialism would by its very nature necessarily develop a higher and better national character, because, under the new system, men would inevitably seek the good of the community first; instead of the love of money, the impelling force would be love of honour (which even at present is a more efficient spur to action than the love of money):

12. There is now a vast commercial waste in advertising,

administrative expenses of rival companies and the like. Under socialism this waste would be avoided, and goods would be made for use, and not be merely got up to sell.

AGAINST

1. The public at large would not be capable of managing their own capital, and experience derived from workmen's associations demonstrates this. Working men are apt to think of capitalists as being a leisured class, and they have no idea of the difficulties of managing a large business.

2. In spite of strikes and commercial crises, the business of the world is very effectively carried on by private enterprise. Moreover, the triumphs of the past have resulted from the competitive system and the principle of individual liberty. The present system is not ideal, but under it the condition of all classes has materially improved, and any interruption of this progress would bring widespread ruin.

3. Competition (with the survival of the fittest) is a law of nature, and no artificial arrangement such as socialism can prevent the operation of this law. We see how salutary the working of competition is in keeping ordinary business upon sound lines, and how mismanagement follows at once when it is removed (as in the case of the London "Tube" companies.)

4. Political economy has established the leading laws of exchange, and socialism is a direct contradiction of this whole science, and as such has to be relegated to the realm of the impracticable.

5. The conditions of modern industry demand, more than ever, capable brains for management, and it is only just that this hard brain-work should be better paid than the mere manual toil. Even if socialism were established, ability would rapidly come to the top and incapacity sink

to the bottom of the scale, and the present state of things would not be long in renewing itself.

6. This is merely the attempt to give Christian sanction to an Utopian dream. A practical demonstration of the terrible evils which would ensue if socialism were to prevail was afforded by the French Revolution of 1848 (*vide* Louis Blanc's unsuccessful attempts to give work to all). If the business of the government of the country were given over to the ignorance and prejudice of the people, everything would be at the mercy of the most effective speaker, and continuous, sound business policy would be an impossibility.

7. Government is scarcely equal now to the duties imposed upon it, and, manifestly, if its duties were largely increased, as under socialism they must be, it would simply break down and anarchy be the result. Great progress has been made, and is being made, under the competitive system, and socialism would bring this to an end. Experience proves that it is under stress, trial and difficulty that the best qualities of men emerge, and if men were lifted into a condition of physical comfort, degeneration would inevitably be the result. As Benjamin Kidd points out in *Social Evolution*, every quality of the mind and body of man is the product of competition, and nothing but evil can follow from transporting him into natural conditions.

8. The extreme views which most socialists hold on religion and marriage show that the natural tendency of the movement would be materially to damage the Church and the family, the two bulwarks of national morality.

9. There is a tendency for thorough-going socialists to develop into anarchists and nihilists. The Russian revolution during the war began with Socialism which developed rapidly into Bolshevism. That socialism makes its strongest appeal to the lowest classes is an indication

that it finds its real lever in Self-interest. It stirs up a class warfare which is ever on the point of breaking into violence, and if there is to be any hope for ordered society, it must be consistently resisted.

10. Socialism would establish a worse despotism than the world has ever seen. It would enfeeble self-reliance and individuality, and reduce all men to the same dependence upon the State. The result would be that the lazy and inefficient would live upon the labour of the industrious and capable.

11. Our present system deals with the social crisis through philanthropic effort, and thus the evil is to some extent mitigated by being the cause and occasion of so much self-sacrifice and devotion. Under socialism this private philanthropy would be replaced by State philanthropy, and the result would be the loss of character in individuals.

12. Under present conditions the pressure of competition and the desire to make things sell produce a high average of work, for unless articles are well made they will not sell ; but under socialism the articles not being made to sell, or being put under the whip of competition, would degenerate in workmanship until all goods would fall to a dead level of average sameness, and all special excellence, which is the condition of progress, would be discouraged. We see this proved by the fact that the effect of trades unions to-day is to reduce skilled labour to the level of the unskilled.

REFERENCES :—

Manifesto of the Communist Party, by Karl Marx and Fred Engels.

(From which many of the arguments *For* are drawn).

Capital, by Karl Marx (Sonnenschein).

Socialism in England, by Sidney Webb. 1890.

Essay on Socialism, by J. S. Mill.

Looking Backward, by Edward Bellamy (Routledge).

German Socialism, by W. H. Dawson, 1891. (Full account of Lassalle).

Handbook of Socialism, by W. D. P. Bliss, 3s. 6d. (Sonnenschein, London, 1895).

Modern Socialism, by R. C. K. Ensor (Harper & Bros., 1904).

British Socialism, by J. Ellis Barker (Smith Elder, 1908).

Practical Socialism, by Canon and Mrs. Barnett (Longmans, 1915).

Social Evolution, by Benjamin Kidd (Macmillan, 1898).

An Enquiry into Socialism, by Thomas Kirkup (Longmans, 1907).

Democracy and Liberty, by W. E. H. Lecky. Vol. ii. chap. viii (Longmans, 1899).

Socialism of To-day, by Emile de Laveleye (Field & Tuer, 1889).

Socialism, by F. B. Kirkman (Jack's People's Books, 1911).

The Socialist Movement, by J. Ramsay MacDonald (Home Univ. Library)

Socialism and Syndicalism, by Philip Snowden (Collins, 1913).

Twentieth Century Socialism, by Edmond Kelly (Longmans, 1910).

A History of British Socialism, by M. Beer (Bell, 1919).

Socialism and Individualism, by Sidney Webb, G. B. Shaw, Sidney Ball, and Sir Oliver Lodge (Fabian Society, 1908).

Article : "The Peril of Socialism," by Lord Sydenham of Combe (Nineteenth Century, March, 1918).

ARE WE TOO FOND OF SPORT AND GAMES ?

YES

1. The conditions of modern life are such that a man must give his entire attention to his own business, and it is partly because we, as a nation, are so taken up with sport, that the trade of the country suffers and the industrious foreigner outstrips us.

2. Sport develops selfishness, as is seen in the case of fox-hunting, when the hunters ride down fences, gallop over newly-sown crops, and cut up the grass land when it is soaked with rain.

3. Sport degrades those who follow it by raising in them the spirit of cruelty ; witness the savagery connected with hunting tame deer, with pigeon-shooting and with rat-catching.

4. Betting, inseparably connected with sport, has become a national evil.

5. Hunting in a wild country stands on quite a different level because there is a necessity for man to preserve his life and to protect his family and flocks ; but stay-at-home sport is merely contemptible, pandering to cruelty and vanity, without leading men into anything which can be called danger or developing anything worthy the name of courage.

6. Our modern sports do not materially differ from old ones, which were condemned as brutal. Stag-hunting does

not differ, except in non-essential details, from bull-baiting.

7. In our schools so much attention is paid to games that boys and girls get into the bad habit of regarding these games, which should only be healthy relaxations, as the principal business of school life. No wonder we are outstripped by foreign nations when such a ridiculously excessive attention is devoted to mere athletics.

8. This over-attention to games is continued into mature life and we see the great golf-obsession flourishing among the well-to-do, while the football obsession fastens on the crowd. A nation whose main object is to amuse itself can never be really great.

NO

1. Sport calls forth manliness, readiness and resource, and is the real cause of many of the qualities which make Englishmen great.

2. Sport is thoroughly popular among the poor, and though there are some complaints of the damage done by fox-hunters, the farmers very readily get compensation. Few of the rustics themselves want the game laws abolished for they know it would soon mean the extinction of game.

3. If such sensitive notions of cruelty are to prevail, then we shall soon be driven into vegetarianism, and be generally at the mercy of faddists.

4. All arguments concerned with betting have nothing to do with the discussion, because betting is not sport, but merely an accidental accompaniment, practised mostly by those who are mere spectators.

5. Men must have amusement of some kind, and under present conditions that kind of sport is the best which is pursued in the open air. There is, admittedly, a certain amount of cruelty to individual animals, but against this

has to be set all the invigoration of mind and body and spirit which the sportsmen gain.

6. There is a radical difference between the old inhumanities of bull and bear-baiting, prize-fighting, etc., and modern field sports, and only an extremist could venture on this comparison. It is very doubtful if the lower animals suffer pain to any considerable extent ; contortions and writhings are usually muscular reactions, and often take place without pain even in men.

7. School athletics are good and supply a salutary relief to the over-burdening of the youthful mind, mis-called education. School sports teach qualities of character for which we are distinguished throughout the world. Englishmen would not be Englishmen were it not for our school games.

8. The general interest in games taken by our maturer population is a very healthy sign, for it would be a disaster if we were to become so absorbed in business as to have no time for these harmless relaxations. A nation which has forgotten how to play is a worn out nation.

REFERENCES :—

- The Sportsman's Handbook* (R. Ward, 1911).
The Sport of Shooting, by O. Jones (E. Arnold, 1911).
Killing for Sport, by H. S. Salt (Bell, 1914).
Wild Life Conservation in Theory and Practice, by W. T. Hornaday (Milford, 1914).
With Rod and Gun, by E. W. D. Cuming (Hodder & Stoughton, 1912).
A Book of National Games, by H. Leather (Blackie, 1914).
Organized Play, by R. E. Roper (Nat. League for Physical Education, 1911).
The Public Schools and the Empire, by H. B. Gray ; chaps. iv., xi. and xx. (Williams & Norgate, 1913).
The Loom of Youth, by Alec Waugh (Grant Richards, 1917).
The Hill, and other School stories, by Horace Aunesley Vachell.
David Blaize, by E. F. Benson.
Stalky and Co., by Rudyard Kipling.

RAILWAY NATIONALIZATION

FOR

1. The Government has made a success of the Post Office and the telegraph service, and why should they not make the same success of the railways?

2. It would lead to a reduction in fares.

3. The misunderstanding between competing lines would be removed, with the result that there would be better connections, and there would not be any of the expenditure now wasted on competing trains. The cost of working the railways would thus be much less, and their convenience to the public largely increased.

4. The railways could be a large source of profit to the Government.

5. The present competition among railways is an advantage to the public, but it is an advantage only secured at a ruinous cost to the companies, who usually, therefore, come to terms, and the public thus lose the benefit of the competition, and the railways might just as well be under state control.

6. The railways are worked by the State in many European countries, and worked successfully.

7. The present directors could be dispensed with, and only those officials maintained who were necessary for the working of the railway. This would effect great economy.

8. Instead of the present multitude of rules, regulations

and bye-laws, there would be but one set, and so every one would know exactly what to expect and what he must pay for himself and his goods.

9. The working expenses being reduced and the fares lower, more use would be made of the railways, and many who now have to live in town could then live in the country.

10. The expense of State purchase is always exaggerated and the profits of the Government would soon make up for the outlay on purchase.

11. The railways have instituted preferential rates in favour of foreign goods, and this would be stopped if they were nationalized.

AGAINST

1. The analogy between the Post Office and the railways does not hold, as the conditions of the services are quite different.

2. When we view the amount of capital required and the stock owned, we see that not the Post Office, but the Admiralty is the true parallel, and this would lead us not to trust the railways to the State.

3. The circumlocution of Government offices and the slowness of Parliamentary control, would be adverse to the effective management of the railways.

4. Continental State railways are well known for their high rates and inefficiency.

5. If competition were removed by the State purchase of railways, a period of official sluggishness and inertia would be introduced.

6. Fares were at about their lowest point before the war, being brought down to that point by competition, and if the competition were removed, high fares would become permanent, because of the expensiveness and waste of state management.

7. The railways at present are sure to be managing their business as economically as is practically possible, and if the Government took them over, no great economy could be effected ; but on the contrary, there well might be a considerable loss.

8. The bye-laws are at present fairly uniform, and the differences between them do not occasion any real inconvenience.

9. The probability is that the local trains would not be so well managed as at present, and people living in the country would not be able to rely on their morning train.

10. The expense of purchase would be enormous, and the prospect of profit to the Government very scanty.

REFERENCES :—

- " Railway Morals and Railway Policy," by Herbert Spencer, in *Essays Political, Scientific and Speculative*, vol. iii.
- English Railways : their development and relation to the State*, by E. Cleveland-Stevens (Routledge, 1919).
- National Railways : an argument for State Purchase*, by J. Hole (Cassell, 1895).
- Railway Nationalisation*, by Clement Edwards (Methuen, 1907).
- How to make the Railways pay for the War*, by Roy Horniman (Routledge, 1917).
- The Case for Railway Nationalisation* by Emil Davies (Collins) ; *The case against Railway Nationalisation* (Collins) ; *Railways and their Rates* (Murray, 1906) ; *State Railways in other Lands* (King, 1907) ; *Railways and Nationalisation* (P. S. King, 1908) ; *The State Railway Muddle in Australia* (Murray, 1912) ; *The Rise of Rail Power in War and Conquest* (King, 1915), by Edwin A. Pratt.
- Article* : " The Past and Future of Railways," by J. H. Balfour-Browne (*Nineteenth Century*, March, 1918).

SHOULD MINES, CANALS, AND THE LIKE BE NATIONALIZED ?

YES

1. Such public works as mines, the laying of tramways, telephones, canals and the like, when worked by private companies, afford too good an opportunity for the growth of grave abuses by reason of the exceptional powers which have to be conferred upon the companies, and they are, therefore, better managed by the State.

2. When these special powers are given to private companies, the result is that there is at once the growth of an immense "interest," often a monopoly, which sometimes becomes so powerful as to be able to corrupt the legislature. Examples of this are conspicuous in America.

3. A public transaction is open to criticism at every stage, and jobbery is hardly possible ; but when any public work is operated by private enterprise, then the accounts are not public property, and jobbery can flourish undetected.

4. The operation of public works by private companies presents so strong a temptation to sharp practice that it is not right for any State to lay such a temptation before any of its citizens.

5. When the State controls its own large enterprises, then it can correct its own mistakes ; but when charters are granted to private companies, then there is no ready remedy, but abuses have to be endured till the charter expires.

6. State monopoly is not monopoly in an evil sense, for it is under the control of the mass of the electorate. Experience has proved that State monopoly, so far from implying

a decrease in the general prosperity, secures valuable additions to the public resources.

NO

1. A company is driven by self-interest to make its service thoroughly efficient and economical, and the public is best served in this way.

2. Abuses can be put down by law ; but if the State takes over the control of its own works, then at once there is inefficiency, officialdom and red-tape, high salaries and pensions, involving a greater waste of money than the abuses of private enterprise.

3. Every work, whether private or public, must be put into the open market to be competed for, and only by this means can prices be kept down. State departments are not actually open to criticism more than private enterprises, as witness the Admiralty and the War Office.

4. Jobbery cannot be prevented by the State taking the work in hand. Whether there is jobbery or not depends entirely on the character of individual men, and not upon whether the undertaking is public or private.

5. By granting charters under conditions, the State often obtains great benefits, by the vast exertions of private enterprise. Whole colonies have been first developed by private endeavour under charter, and finally taken over by the Government as valuable territory. This was the case with India, and shows how well private and public enterprise dovetail.

6. State trading implies restriction and monopoly, which act as a powerful check on the energy and effort of the members of the State. Thus the more the State controls industry, the less will be the prosperity of the State.

REFERENCES :—

Handbook on Canals, Canal Control Committee (Stationery Office, 1918, 6d.).

See under RAILWAY NATIONALISATION,

IS SUICIDE EVER JUSTIFIABLE ?

NO

1. The real purpose of life is the development of the individual character, and not as is vulgarly supposed, to make money, to succeed, or even to be happy. It is often only in pain, sorrow, disappointment and loss that a particular character can develop, and if that person allows himself to be overwhelmed by his misfortunes and resorts to the desperate act of suicide, he is not only putting a sudden and fateful stop to his own best chances of real progress, but he is defying those mysterious laws upon which his fate has been ordered. Such an act of what might be called cosmic rebellion can never be justified.

2. If life is confined to this one existence, beginning at birth and ending at death, then suicide might in many cases be justified, when life has become an intolerable burden : but if, as is much more likely, life extends far beyond birth and death, if we must ever return to the task until it is well finished, then there can be no justification nor even reason in refusing for the moment to face an ordeal which we must ultimately go through, for suicide can manifestly only make the conditions of our particular trial worse.

3. In spite of the fact that the individual life is of little importance compared to the welfare of the race, nevertheless there is good reason for believing that every life, however obscure, has some definite purpose. The exaggeration of

this latter view has in the past led to the encouragement of too many self-conscious prigs, but in modern times the emphasis given to the former view has led to a disastrous individual pessimism, which has been the cause of many suicides. Truth lies between these two views :—each life has undoubtedly a definite, if often limited purpose, and to cut it short before that purpose is achieved can never be a justifiable action.

4. Suicide is essentially pagan. It cannot be justified on Christian principles and the modern, nominally Christian state is quite right in attaching pains and penalties to attempted suicide.

5. The practice of suicide is the outcome of the selfish view of life, which makes a man so self-centred that he regards his own pleasures and pains as all-important. In short, all morbidity is selfish and cannot be justified, except upon a false, individualistic view of the world.

6. Suicide is the outrage of one of the great laws of nature—the law of self-preservation—and hence, science must condemn suicide.

YES

1. If this argument has any weight, it must be equally immoral for a man to save his life when he is in imminent danger, from the fear that he may be prolonging his life beyond what was intended for him, and be failing to obey the law of his own fate.

2. This appeal to the dubious doctrine of re-incarnation shows how difficult it is to find valid arguments against the justifiability of suicide. If through the action of fate, or cosmic forces, or chance, or whatever term may be applied to the constraining necessity under which he lives, a man's life has become so miserable that he no longer cares for it, then he is justified in putting an end to it. He was not

asked to take over the burden of life, he gave no consent to live, and it is therefore unjust to deprive him of his right to choose to die.

3. If the action is in any way prejudicial to society, then it may be immoral ; but what if the action is beneficial to society by removing a person suffering from a hopeless and infectious disease, and beneficial to a large circle of relations and friends, by removing from them a heavy load of care and expense ? Then suicide is not only justifiable, but noble.

4. Christianity nowhere forbids suicide, but has left the question to be settled by the good sense of each man. Such is the natural fear of death that nothing but the greatest misery of body or mind ever drives a man to suicide. Given this great misery, then Christianity itself would shrink from preventing a hapless human being availing himself of the only escape from hopeless wretchedness.

5. This argument rests on a confusion. The soldier who volunteers for a forlorn hope is a suicide, yet his deed is applauded, though he may have no higher-motive than a desire for notoriety. It would not be well for society if pure altruism were to prevail, and the first effect of such pure altruism would be an immense number of suicides, from the unselfish motive of reducing the competition of life.

6. In the case of many suicides this instinct of self-preservation does not exist, but an equally natural impulse towards self-destruction does exist. In fact, many of the weak, diseased, degenerate and abnormal would be going contrary to the promptings of nature if they did not commit suicide. How can we condemn suicide in the case of a man wishing to escape torture by Red Indians, or of the ladies in the Indian Mutiny eager to escape dishonour at the hands of the Sepoys, or of hapless Russians in face of

the horrors of Bolshevism, or in any similar case? If we make exceptions of these, we agree that suicide is, under certain conditions, justifiable.

REFERENCES :—

- Suicide*, by Henry Morselli (International Scientific Series).
Essay on Suicide, by David Hume. (This book is difficult to procure, but its contents are discussed in Sir Leslie Stephen's *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*).
Man and Woman, by Havelock Ellis : chaps. xii. and xv. (Walter Scott, 1914).
The Ethics of Suicide, by F. H. Perry-Coste (University Press, Watford, 1898, 6d.).
On Suicide, by W. Wynn Westcott (Balliere, Tindall & Cox, 1905).
The Suicide Club, by Robert Louis Stevenson.
Interplay, by Beatrice Harraden. Part II. (Methuen).
Root and Branch, chaps. i., iii. and viii., by R. Allatini (Allen & Unwin, 1917).

SHOULD WE HAVE THE CONTINENTAL SUNDAY ?

NO

1. Unless we want to cease to be a Christian nation we must maintain the Christian observance of Sunday as a day of rest and worship.

2. The experience of the world has proved that the health of men requires one day's rest in seven. Where this beneficent rule is not obeyed, not only the health, but the quality of work done rapidly degenerates.

3. Modern life has become so hurried and the pursuit of pleasure so feverish that there is no time left for thought, for meditation, for reading, except on Sunday. If the Continental Sunday were introduced life would become so strenuous that it would cease to be worth while.

4. The habit of church attendance is falling off seriously with the result that the nation is becoming increasingly materialistic. What fearful effects this materialism may have we see in the Great War, which arose directly from German materialism. If the looseness of the Continental Sunday were allowed, church attendance would decrease still further, while materialism would spread with lightning rapidity.

5. The demand for the Continental Sunday arises from false, hedonistic views of life. The object of life is not pleasure, but the development of personality. For the

achievement of this great purpose nothing is so essential as the regularly recurring day of rest, and even if in some cases there should be self-denial involved, this is all to the good. - Our views may have changed as to the termination of "the primrose path," but anyway we know it does not lead us upward.

6. We owe many of the best qualities of our race to our Puritan forefathers, and although they erred in their stern repression of amusement and even of art itself, nevertheless we would make a grave mistake if we were to throw away the last vestige of their influence still left with us and allow ourselves to degenerate to the Continental Sunday.

7. The present Sunday regulations are no tyranny but the Continental Sunday would be, for thousands would be forced to work that the few might be amused.

YES

1. The Sabbath law is an old Jewish law, and has no validity for modern life apart from considerations of general public utility and convenience.

2. The tendency of competition and the strain of modern life cannot be resisted by sentimental considerations. It may be desirable to maintain the sanctity of the Sunday, but it is not possible under modern conditions.

3. It is the very strenuousness of modern life which gives rise to the demand for the relaxation of the Continental Sunday. The medical examinations for conscription in the Great War disclosed an alarmingly high percentage of the unfit. This unfitness has arisen mainly from the unhealthy and cramping conditions of employment. The only cure is more air, more exercise, more healthy distraction. Saturday afternoon is inadequate, but if Sunday also could be devoted freely to recuperation and healthy

sport, we should soon be well on the way to secure an A 1 population.

4. That church attendance is decreasing is the fault of the Church. Forbidding men to play healthy games on Sunday does not send them to church, but only encourages aimless loafing and drinking. It is better our youth should be busy with the cricket bat than with the bottle : in any case you cannot, by prohibiting him to touch his bat, induce him to take up his hymn-book.

5. The Continental Sunday is demanded not to bring more amusement, but to raise the general standard of health and vigour. Our soldiers have become accustomed to the Continental Sunday during their service abroad. They understand its advantages and are no longer prepared to submit to the old sabbatarian tyranny.

6. The typical Puritan is a pessimist. "He has set up a sort of bogey which he calls life" as W. L. George says. He is cruel to himself and tyrannical to others. His view of life is false and happily out-of-date. He may have served a useful purpose in a time of universal libertinage, but to-day he is a mere survival, an impediment in the path of progress. The present dull, Puritan, English Sunday manufactures drunkards and debauchees. Get the people into the open air and into the country on Sunday and you won't do them any harm.

7. The adoption of the Continental Sunday would of course mean that the service of trains, buses, trams, etc. would have to be increased on Sunday, instead of decreased as at present. This would involve a great increase in Sunday labour, but this difficulty could easily be met by giving those who had to work on Sunday some other day as a holiday. The general benefit to the public far outweighs this small administrative difficulty.

REFERENCES :—

- The Ten Commandments*, by R. W. Dale (Hodder & Stoughton).
Democracy and Liberty, by W. E. H. Lecky : vol. ii, chap. vii. (Longmans, 1899).
Sabbath Essays and the Sabbath Services, ed. by W. C. Wood (1880).
The Church of England ; its Nature and its Future : a symposium (University of London Press, 1919).
The Heart of the Empire : a symposium. Chap. vii. " The Church and the People " (Fisher Unwin, 1901).
The Public Schools and the Empire (chap. xiv. " Religion in Public Schools "), by H. B. Gray (Williams & Norgate, 1913).
Life and Labour in London (Third Series ; *Religious Influences*, and also Final Volume, Part II. Sec. 2), by Charles Booth (Macmillan, 1903).
The Church and the People, by Joseph McCabe (Watts, 1919).
An Essay on Going to Church, by G. Bernard Shaw (reprinted by Luce & Co., Boston, from *The Savoy Quarterly*, London, 1896).
Free Opinions freely Expressed (chap. xviii. " Society and Sunday "), by Marie Corelli (Constable, 1905).
Eddies of the Day, by W. L. George (Cassell, 1919). (Essay on Puritanism).

ARE THE RESULTS OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS SATISFACTORY ?

NO

1. The spiritual faculties can only be truly developed on the basis of the moral faculties, and Sunday Schools, by attempting to develop the spiritual faculties before this necessary basis is laid, have often no effect upon the children, and sometimes turn them into hypocrites.

2. Children are trained in dogma before they can possibly understand it, and as they are naturally dissatisfied with the dogmas they cannot understand, they are early led to an attitude of suspicion and distrust in religious matters.

3. The Bible is used as a task-book, the facts of which they must "get up," and many passages of which they must learn, with the result that they early contract a dislike for it, and in their mature years make little use of it.

4. In Sunday Schools this task-work is so closely connected with worship by the compulsory learning of hymns, creeds, and prayers, that the child early begins to feel an impatience of public worship which manifests itself in later years in slack church attendance. The pressure also which the parents bring to bear upon the children to make them attend the school defeats its object by rousing their opposition.

5. The instruction is often left in the hands of narrow-

minded teachers, and the children thereby obtain a wrong conception of Christianity, which they afterwards revolt from as unreasonable. In this way children are taught as ascertained facts what they afterwards discover to be mere hypotheses, and are even trained to credit as matters of history what they afterwards find to be legends.

6. Children are sick of weekday school drill, and want a quiet Sunday.

YES

1. Religion is the only basis for morals, and it is therefore right and necessary that children's education should begin with religion, and the Sunday Schools are the best means of systematic training on these lines.

2. A certain amount of dogma is necessary even for children before they can understand the nature of Christianity, and they are wisely taught in Sunday Schools in early life to make these essential dogmas matters of faith. Faith is a faculty as much as reason, and unless it is early trained it becomes weak from lack of use.

3. This criticism might have been justly directed against the old-fashioned Sunday School, but recently the whole method of teaching has been so much improved that the old faults have almost entirely disappeared. Children are no longer taught in the old narrow-minded way, but the Bible is made interesting by being treated in a modern manner. Not only is this the case, but modern Sunday Schools comprise extra-Biblical classes which are very valuable. This latter tendency will no doubt develop further, until at last the children will be eager to attend and will be the more ready to reap the benefit of a really well-planned course of training in Christian character.

4. True worship is a habit of the soul, and those habits which the children early acquire have a permanent influence

on their lives. When men and women neglect public worship, the cause is often to be found in the lack of Sunday School teaching in their youth. So much is the truth of this felt in Wales that Sunday School teaching there is often continued into mature life to the great benefit of the people.

5. A great Sunday School revival has recently taken place. The movement began in America and is now spreading over the United Kingdom. The administration of the schools has been much improved by grading the various classes, by improving the music and the libraries and above all by removing the terrible old Calvinistic elements from the teaching. The children are allowed to share in the new light thrown on old problems by recent research and thought. Special care is devoted to the younger classes, and so the children are prevented from falling away as they grow older.

6. If children have a "quiet Sunday," they only get into mischief.

REFERENCES :—

- An Encyclopædia of Sunday Schools* (Nelson, 1917).
Efficiency in the Sunday School (Hodder & Stoughton, 1912); and
The Modern Sunday School (Revell, 1916), by H. F. Cope.
The Sunday School Problem, by T. W. Berry (Educational Pub. Co. 1911).
Means and Methods in the Religious Education of the Young, by John Davidson (Longmans, 1917).
Sunday School Teaching: a symposium (1912); and *Sunday Schools and Religious Education*: a symposium (1913) (Longmans).
For Childhood and Youth, by H. T. Mark (Clarke, 1913), has a bibliography.
The Growth of the Graded Sunday School, by S. A. Warner (Headley, 1914).
The Decentralised Sunday School, by E. J. Archibald (Pilgrim Press, 1913): a course of lessons for beginners which shows the modern methods in Sunday School teaching.

IS THE INVESTIGATION OF PSYCHIC PHENOMENA DANGEROUS ?

YES

1. The investigation of these phenomena is at best unhealthy for the ordinary person, because it develops a morbid, superstitious temperament, leading to a loss of interest in the ordinary affairs of life. What is at the beginning a curious fascination for these phenomena may easily develop into a feverish absorption, very dangerous to mental stability.

2. Traditions of evil spirits date back to the earliest times and there seems to be at least this much foundation for all these superstitions—the forces brought into manifestation at a spiritistic séance, whatever their nature or cause, are undoubtedly in many cases mischievous, if not positively malevolent. Hence it is often dangerous to tamper with these phenomena of which we understand so little. A blind man may traverse a precipitous ridge in safety, but it is none the less a very dangerous thing for him to attempt.

3. The curious and interesting cases of double personality seem to lead to the conclusion that under certain circumstances it is possible for the normal personality to find itself dislodged, at least for a time, and its place taken by another personality, frequently of quite a different character. There is a very great danger of something of this kind taking place at a séance. No one should run such a risk for the sake of idle curiosity.

4. These séances are dangerous also for the mediums, for not only are they likely to suffer from nervous attacks during hypnosis, but there may be great difficulty in awaking them afterwards. The medium becomes also too easily hypnotised, falling at last completely into the power of the hypnotiser. If the medium is self-hypnotised, then there is a danger of this becoming a habit, so that the victim is constantly falling into a trance without wishing to do so. All these and other dangers are manifest, while the small results of these investigations do not compensate for the risks.

NO

1. It is only superstition which has surrounded these phenomena with an atmosphere of terror. The very object of modern investigations is to strip these facts of their superstitious accretions by finding out their causes, nature and methods of working. Insanity may arise from fear, but hardly from a desire for enlightenment. To admit that weak-minded and superstitious people should avoid these subjects does not imply that they are at all dangerous for normal and healthy minds to investigate.

2. There is hardly any healthy exercise which under certain circumstances may not become dangerous. Shall we give up motoring, sailing, climbing and flying because accidents happen? As a matter of fact, however, it is found that if these experiments are undertaken in the right spirit there is practically no danger from the occasional mischievousness and even malevolence of the forces set in motion. These investigations are of course unsuited for children and nervous dyspeptics.

3. The danger of obsession is serious, if it exists. The whole subject of dual personality is, however, at present very obscure and the best way of reaching some reasonable

understanding of it, is precisely by the investigation of these phenomena. We only have the vaguest notions of what the human spirit is. Some of us are not very sure whether it survives death or not. Psychic investigations promise to throw much light on these and kindred questions. Is it reasonable then to put up a big danger-board to prevent an inquiry which may well lead to the removal of the danger itself?

4. A chloroform sleep is dangerous and accidents have arisen, because chloroform is really a poisoning of the system. There is no danger, however, in hypnotic sleep, which is exactly like real sleep. In skilful hands there is no trouble about the re-awaking. The hypnotic state passes like a period of sleep without leaving the slightest injurious trace on the intellectual faculties. Even fatigue and headache in the medium are usually caused by carelessness or even roughness in awaking them too suddenly. Any evil effects which may arise can easily be prevented by judicious suggestion. Of course it is taken for granted that experiments of this kind should only be undertaken by serious minded people who are careful to take every precaution. In short there is no danger inherent in the investigation itself, when properly conducted.

REFERENCES :—

- The Follies and Frauds of Spiritualism*, by Walter Mann (Watts, 1919).
Science and a Future Life (Ward Lock, 1905); *The Borderland of Psychical Research*, and *Enigmas of Psychical Research* (Putnam, 1906), by J. H. Hyslop.
Spiritualism and Christianity, by the Rev. G. Longridge (Mowbray, 1918).
Spirit, Matter, and Morals, by R. Dimsdale Stocker (Leopold Hill, 1908).
That Other World, by Stuart Cumberland (Grant Richards, 1918).
The Question: if a Man Die, shall he live again? by E. Clodd (Richards, 1918).

246 HANDBOOK FOR LITERARY SOCIETIES

Experiments in Psychical Science, by W. J. Crawford (Watkins, 1919).

Spiritualism and Psychical Research, by J. Arthur Hill (Jack's People's Books).

The Dangers of Spiritualism, J. Godfrey Raupert (Kegan Paul, 1906).

Sermons on Modern Spiritualism, by A. V. Millar (Kegan Paul, 1908).

Spirit Experiences, by Dr. C. A. Mercier (Watts, 1919).

Common-Sense Thoughts on a Life Beyond, by F. J. Gould (Watts, 1919).

Article : "The Deeper Issues of Psychical Research," by Sir W. Barrett (*Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1918).

SHOULD THEOLOGICAL DIFFICULTIES BE FREELY DISCUSSED ?

YES

1. There is an ever-recurring tendency for prevalent public opinion to tyrannize over all innovations, and the exponents of orthodoxy forget their own human fallibility in deed, though they plentifully acknowledge it in words.

2. Thus we see that nearly every idea that has enlightened the world has been resisted and all but done to death before it could gain a hearing ; opinions now called orthodox have been gained in this way, and it is, therefore, quite unreasonable for those who hold opinions thus obtained to condemn fresh innovations. We see the fate that Socrates met, and that Christ met, and to refuse the free discussion of theological difficulties is to mete out to new truth the same condemnation.

3. Theological difficulties are not freely discussed at present, because every kind of social opposition meets the man who has any new ideas, so much so that he is tempted to say nothing about them, to the great loss of the world. The whole modern practice of confining preaching to those who hold certain views tends to discourage any free discussion, for views opposite to those of the preachers cannot be justly represented except by those who really believe in those views and explain them with the accent of conviction.

4. Human beings can make a safe approach to the truth only after examining all sides of a question, and unless theological difficulties are freely discussed and shown from different view-points, there can be no real knowledge of the truth, but only prejudice and superstition.

5. When it is said that orthodox opinions are so useful to society that to have them publicly questioned would endanger morality and religion, it is forgotten that the utility of any given set of opinions is as disputable as the opinions themselves ; *e.g.*, note the case of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, who thought it was his duty, with a view to the people's good, to persecute Christianity,—the same kind of mistake is made to-day. No truth can be destructive to the principles of morality and true religion. Even error should be heard, for it helps to define the truth.

NO

1. Innovations in the popular faith are by their very nature the most dangerous of all innovations, and it is well that they should be received with mistrust ; the exponents of orthodoxy do not assert their own infallibility, but only the authority of their Faith.

2. If theological difficulties are to be freely discussed there will be as many opinions as there are disputants. All uniformity of creed or of worship will become impossible. Churches will degenerate into Debating Societies.

3. Theological difficulties are at present freely enough discussed both in the press and in the pulpit, and even as things are, this leads to much irreverence and irreligion, and it is, therefore, well that the practice should be discouraged, that people should be taught just what is essential and that highly technical matters should be left to experts in theology.

4. Theological difficulties should not be freely discussed

because the great majority of the public are not competent to pronounce an opinion on the subject. It requires a careful education in philosophy and religious thought before a man's views on theological questions are worth anything ; to throw the whole subject open to general discussion would be therefore futile. The ordinary school " education " is an extremely small and insecure platform from which to announce views on the most difficult of all questions.

5. If any general freedom of discussion were encouraged there would be no end to the follies, fads, and absurdities, which would distract the public until they would be driven to take refuge in a general scepticism.

REFERENCES :—

- Liberty*, by John Stuart Mill.
Essays on Freethinking and Plainspeaking, by Sir Leslie Stephen (Duckworth, 1907).
A History of Freedom of Thought, by J. B. Bury (Home University Library).
The Bible and Criticism, by W. H. Bennett and W. F. Adeney (Jack's People's Books).
Comparative Religion, by J. Estlin Carpenter (Home University Library, 1913).
The God which is Man, by R. Dimsdale Stocker (Francis Griffiths, 1912).
Discovery and Revelation, by H. F. Hamilton (Longmans, 1915).
Modernism, by M. D. Petre (Jacks, 1918).
The Religion of To-morrow, by W. J. Colville (Rider & Son, 1917).
Faith in Fetters, by the Rev. T. R. R. Stebbing (Fisher Unwin, 1919).
The Quest for Truth, by Prof. Silvanus Thompson (Headley Bros., 1915).
Religious Persecution, by E. S. P. Haynes (Duckworth, 1906).
On Compromise, by Lord Morley (Macmillan, 1886).
Article : " The Roots of Faith," by Prof. Cairns (*Contemporary Review*, June, 1918).

ARE TRADE UNIONS ON THE WHOLE MISCHIEVOUS OR BENEFICIAL ?

BENEFICIAL

1. The only way to rebut tyranny is to combine to put it down ; so trades unionism is the only resource for the labourer, who naturally seeks just conditions of life.

2. The right of combination must be conceded to the men if this is to be a free country.

3. The workman's skill is the commodity which he has to sell, and he is right, according to the whole practice of commerce, in making the most of it.

4. Employers, especially when united in large companies, have no sense of responsibility for their employés, and hence the only resource of the workmen is to force them to understand this obligation.

5. Trades Unions are of great practical benefit to the men in assisting them to get work, to travel in search of work, and even to emigrate.

6. They have fully justified their existence by their success in so frequently getting the wages of the men raised.

7. They develop the capacity for self-government among the men, and create in them a strong feeling of self-respect.

8. The leaders get little more than their wages for their services, and suffer loss by being in bad odour with the employers.

9. Trades Unions call forth a spirit of mutual sympathy and brotherhood among their members.

10. Trades Unions mark a progress from the desire of using violent remedies to the desire of using legal and pacific remedies, which are the only effective ones.

11. Political economy is not an exact science, and though some of its exponents pronounce Trades Unions harmful, that is not an indication that they are so. Trades Unions are developing, and only in the long run can we tell whether their tendency is harmful or not.

12. Strike organization is not by any means the only work done by Trades Unions—they make provision against accident and sickness, and strengthen the feeling of the unity of labour all over the world.

MISCHIEVOUS

1. A man has the right to manage his business as he finds best, and when Trades Unions bring force to bear upon him to rebut what they call his tyranny, they are despotically seeking to interfere with his private rights.

2. The despotism of the Unions over the men is far worse than that of the masters, and the power of initiative is crushed out of the men.

3. Trades Unions intensify the antagonism between rich and poor, increase the difficulty of the social problem by rousing the hostility of the masters and, by trying to sell the labour of the men wholesale, do not get the best terms for it.

4. It is impossible to *force* employers to understand a moral obligation to their men, and the use of compulsion will only irritate them into ignoring it.

5. Any small benefits which the Unions confer are dearly bought by levies on the wages of the men.

6. They stand self-condemned, because their inevitable

effect is seen to be the driving of trade from the country.

7. They encourage among the men a spirit of unrest and even of sedition, which is directly harmful to the trade of the country.

8. Trades Unions are often worked by unscrupulous agitators, whose minds are more occupied with their own personal interests than with the good of the workman.

9. Trades Unions reduce the skilled workman to the level of the unskilled, and really constitute a despotism of ignorance and inefficiency over intelligence and skill.

10. Trades Unions, by the constant resort to intimidation and even to violence, rouse the spirit of anarchy, and constitute a menace to the public peace.

11. The ratio of supply to demand is a natural one, and cannot be altered by arbitrary means.

12. Better provision against illness and accident is made by clubs which exist for that purpose alone, and whose funds are not liable to be exhausted by long, disastrous strikes.

REFERENCES :—

- Trades Unions*, by Joseph Clayton (Jack's People's Books).
Industrial Democracy (1902) and *The History of Trades Unionism* (1911), by Sidney and Beatrice Webb (Longmans).
Trades Unionism and British Industry, by Edwin A. Pratt (Murray, 1904).
The Law of Trades Unions, by T. S. Jevons (Wilson's Legal Handy Books, 1907).
The State in relation to Labour, by W. S. Jevons (Macmillan, 1910).
The Hope for Society : a symposium (Bell, 1919).
Trades Unionism, by P. W. Wilson (Social Ideals Series, 1909).
An Alphabet of Economics, by A. R. Orage (Fisher Unwin, 1917).
Self-Government in Industry and The World of Labour (1913); by G. D. H. Cole (Bell).
The Future of Work, by Leo Chiozza Money (Fisher Unwin, 1914).
Political Economy, by W. S. Jevons. Chap. viii. (Macmillan).
Trades Unionism, New and Old, by George Howell (1891).

SHOULD WE ABOLISH TRIAL BY JURY ?

NO

1. This is one of the oldest institutions we have, and is one of the best elements in our national life. It proceeds upon the principle that every man has a right to be tried by his peers.

2. The system has been so wrought into our whole manner of thinking that it could not be changed without grave danger to justice.

3. The jury, being composed usually of business men of broad experience, is the best possible body to decide upon the guilt or innocence of the accused : the judge by his training is fitted to decide on matters of law ; but if his functions were to be extended, much injustice would result from judicial prejudice.

4. Our system is found in experience to work very well ; for when both sides of a case are fully laid before these juries, they almost invariably arrive at a decision which the general moral sense of the community would endorse.

5. In every trial two kinds of questions arise : questions of law and questions of fact. Our system provides for these in the best possible manner by ordaining that " questions of law are for the judge, questions of fact for the jury."

YES

1. Juries originally arose from a natural effort on the part of the people to prevent the tyranny of the despotic king ; it was the means by which the people sought to take over the decision on questions of guilt and innocence into their own hands, but the law has become so complicated that now juries are in the hands of the legal experts, and consequently juries usually decide according to the judge's summing up.

2. The system is felt to be more and more inadequate. The best citizens evade going on the jury whenever they can, and it very often happens that a difficult question has to be settled by men who have not sufficient education to enter fully into the merits of the case.

3. Most men now would prefer to be tried altogether by a judge with a reputation for knowledge and impartiality to lose, than by a jury who would be more anxious to bring the trial to a conclusion as soon as possible than to arrive at a just decision.

4. Juries are far too susceptible to the appeals of counsel, and whether a man is brought in guilty or not usually depends to a large extent upon the eloquence of his counsel, with the natural result that high fees are given for good counsel, and hence justice, so-called, is far more easily obtained by the rich man than by the poor. There is, therefore, great need of reform taking the direction of free justice for all, and State lawyers to decide the cases.

5. Our jury system shows its weakness in the difficulty which is found in deciding what are questions of law and what are questions of fact. Counsel and judge are continually at issue as to whether a point ought to go to the jury or not.

6. The judge, counsel, prisoners, witnesses and spectators are all interested in the case, but the jury is not. They

have been dragged from their business, and set down to decide upon a complicated series of facts. Under these unfavourable circumstances it is a mere accident if justice is done.

REFERENCES :—

Short History of the English People, by J. R. Green : chap. ii. Sec. viii.

English Constitutional History, by Taswell Langmead (Stevens, 1911).

Constitutional History, by W. Stubbs (Oxford University Press, 1897).

The Norman Conquest, by E. A. Freeman : vol. v. p. 451.

History of Trial by Jury, by William Forsyth (1852).

A Practical Treatise on the Law relating to Juries, by W. G. Huband (Stevens, 1911).

The Jury Laws and their Amendment, by T. W. Erle (Stevens, 1882).

Our Jury System a Scandal, a pamphlet, by J. F. H. Woodward (Carr, 1888).

Resurrection, by Leo Tolstoy.

SHOULD VACCINATION BE ENFORCED BY LAW ?

YES

1. In 1871 a Committee of the House of Commons met to consider the objections raised by anti-vaccinators, and, after going into the facts, reported that "There need be no apprehension that vaccination will injure health or communicate any disease."

2. The effect of vaccination in protecting us against small-pox has been very remarkable. Dr. Farr tells us that in the last century the deaths from small-pox amounted annually to 3,000 per 1,000,000 of the population. Since 1871, when Boards of Guardians were obliged by Act of Parliament to appoint vaccination officers, the deaths from small-pox have averaged only 156 per 1,000,000. The only reason that vaccination is not more successful still is because it is impossible to carry it out more thoroughly.

3. That this remarkable result is not due merely to sanitation is shown by the fact that other diseases have not decreased at anything like the same rate. Sir Lyon Playfair, in the House of Commons, on June 19th, 1883, stated this point lucidly : " If we compare the period of gratuitous vaccination with that of efficient compulsory vaccination, the Registrar-General tells us that, among children under five, the small-pox mortality has decreased by eighty per cent., while that from all other diseases has only decreased

by six per cent." Isolation may avail for a few cases, but when there is anything in the nature of an epidemic isolation is plainly impossible.

4. In Germany before the war small-pox had been practically stamped out by compulsory vaccination, but in Great Britain there were 150,000 unvaccinated persons in 1893 and nearly 250,000 in 1897. It is plain that, unless we enforce vaccination stringently, we are in serious danger of an epidemic.

5. The small-pox figures in London do not afford the anti-vaccinators a valid argument, because if even only five per cent. are not vaccinated, that still means that there are 190,000 persons who are fit subjects for an epidemic to seize upon.

6. Even the Medical Officers of Health, who are specially interested in sanitation, have confessed that the only means of controlling small-pox is by vaccination and re-vaccination. In presence of the Bill of 1898, the Incorporated Society of Medical Officers memorialized the Government on this point.

7. In 1880 a small-pox epidemic took place in San Francisco. "The general death-rate was 18·27 per 1,000; among the Chinese, who crowded together in their own quarter in squalor, it was 21·2. Vaccination was compulsory on the American population, but not upon the Chinese, and the result was that the Chinese quarter became a centre of infection for the rest of the town." The Medical Officer of Health thus sums up his report: "This case clearly shows (1) the effect of what may be called a smouldering fire of small-pox, in keeping up a source of infection, which may break out into renewed conflagration when materials exist for it; (2) the non-limitation of small-pox infection to any class in society; and (3) the protective power of efficient vaccination, as shown alike in the

immunity of the previously vaccinated juvenile population, and in the speedy check put upon the epidemic spread of the disease among the elders."

8. The conscience clause in the Bill of 1898, which makes vaccination optional, is a yielding to the outcries of ignorant agitators, and has endangered the health of the community.

NO

1. Vaccination so far from preventing disease tends to produce it. The *British Medical Journal*, 1877, says: "In addition to the fact that people are ill after vaccination, it is important to remember that people die after the operation, if not from the disease itself, at least from its sequelæ, notably erysipelas." There is grave danger of vaccination inoculating a patient with a disease which may lie dormant in his system for years before breaking out.

2. Vaccination has little effect in warding off small-pox. When Dr. Jenner had been rewarded by Parliament, and the people were so sanguine that they talked of devoting the London Small-pox Hospital to some other use, a fresh epidemic of small-pox burst out (1804) which filled the hospital with patients. "In the London hospitals of the Asylums Board more than 53,000 small-pox patients have been treated (1891), and of these no fewer than 41,000 were medically recorded as vaccinated. In the Orphan Homes at Bristol, in the 1871 epidemic, 293 children took the disease, and they had all been vaccinated. Herr Kolb, of Munich, says that in Bavaria, in 1871, out of 30,742 cases of small-pox, 29,429 were vaccinated persons."

3. The undoubted decrease of small-pox is due solely to sanitation.

4. Compulsory vaccination is a piece of severe class legislation, for all the force of such an Act bears upon the poor. The rich easily escape because they are not betrayed,

and if they are, they can readily afford the fine. Poor people who conscientiously resist such a law are subject to repeated summonses, and persecuted into compliance.

5. Since Dr. Jenner's time the medical profession has shifted its ground on the vaccination question. At first they said no vaccinated person could take small-pox ; now they admit that the effect of vaccination wears off in time. They are not at all agreed as to the number of marks necessary for full protection.

6. The statistics are largely adjusted to suit the vaccinators. Dr. Vacher states in his *Notes on the Small-pox Epidemic at Birkenhead* that only those patients were entered as vaccinated who displayed undoubted cicatrices, and goes on to say that " the mere assertion of the patients or their friends that they were vaccinated counted for nothing, as about 80 per cent. of the patients in the third column (" unknown ") were reported as having been vaccinated."

7. The way this subject is agitated is an evidence of how little medical men are convinced in their own minds of their doctrine of vaccination ; they are so committed to it, however, that it is impossible for them to abandon their ground.

8. Vaccination is at best a very fallible and uncertain remedy, and it carries with it danger of worse diseases : on the other hand, small-pox manifestly yields to sanitation. Legal compulsion only makes " martyrs," and increases the agitation against vaccination ; the conscience clause, therefore, in the Bill of 1898 is thoroughly statesmanlike.

REFERENCES :—

Vaccination, a delusion, by Alfred Russell Wallace (Sonnenschein, 1878).

The Vaccination Question, by C. K. Millard (H. K. Lewis, 1914).

Jenner and Vaccination, by Charles Creighton (Sonnenschein, 1889).

The Whole Armour of Man, by C. W. Saleeby (Grant Richards, 1919).

Compulsory Vaccination in England (E. W. Allen, 1884) ; and *The Recrudescence of Leprosy* (Sonnenschein, 1894), by W. Tebb.

The Story of a Great Delusion, by William White (E. W. Allen, 1885).

The Romance of Medicine, by Ronald C. McFie (Cassell, 1907).

The History and Pathology of Vaccination, by E. M. Crookshank (Lewis, 1889).

A Century of Vaccination, by W. Scott Tebb (Sonnenschein, 1899).

The Prevention of Small-pox, by E. M. Crookshank (H. K. Lewis, 1894).

Articles: "The Vaccination Act of 1898," by Mrs. Fawcett (*Contemporary Review*, March, 1899). "The Theory of Vaccine Treatment," by W. G. Millar (*The English Mechanic*, Oct. 29, 1915). "Vaccine and Vaccination," by Dr. Woods Hutchinson (*Nash's and Pall Mall*, Oct. 1915).

SHOULD WE PROHIBIT VIVISECTION ?

YES

1. Science has fully established the close relationship existing between man and the lower animals. We see them now as rudimentary editions of ourselves, and consequently the more enlightened we are, the more horror ought we to feel at the practice of vivisection.

2. When men of science, who have taught us the relationship between ourselves and the other animals, try to justify vivisection, they are really acting upon the abominable doctrine that the weak have no claims upon the strong.

3. If this pernicious doctrine be once admitted, where are we going to stop ? If it is right to experiment upon dogs, chimpanzees, and other intelligent and affectionate animals, why not experiment upon idiots, criminals, savages, women, children, and unsuccessful men ?

4. In view of the excellent charts, diagrams, and the like now available, it is not necessary that students should witness cruel experiments in order to understand what they are taught.

5. The barbarities of the chase or of the shambles cannot excuse the barbarities of the Physiological Laboratory. The sportsman often inflicts his cruelties thoughtlessly from a weak desire to imitate other men, or from a still feebler desire to be considered a sportsman ; but the scientist knows the pain he is inflicting, and acts with his eyes wide open. As far as the shambles are concerned, to kill

animals expeditiously is manifestly a very different thing from torturing them.

6. To contend that vivisectors are actuated by motives of humanity is mere moonshine, for a man cannot follow this revolting study without becoming callous to suffering, both animal and human.

7. The mind that seeks to justify the infliction of pain upon animals on the score of the benefit to the race of men is simply immoral. The end cannot justify the means, and men have no right to inflict suffering of this agonizing kind for any object.

NO

1. It must be acknowledged that science has done more to alleviate human suffering than any other agency in the world, and science has now reached the stage at which vivisection becomes necessary in order that the secrets of life may be discovered. The absolute necessity of vivisection is its defence.

2. Every treatment of an unknown disease is experimental, whether in men or in animals, and it is a very fine ethical point whether, if a man is justified in experimenting for cure upon his fellow-men (as all doctors must do), he is not also justified in experimenting upon animals to try and discover the cause of the disease and the cure. To talk as if eminent and humane medical men have no feeling for the sufferings of animals is merely hysterical.

3. Experimentation is carried out for a definite purpose and not for its own sake, and a large part of the really useful vivisection can be conducted painlessly.

4. It is an axiom of all modern teaching that the student, as far as possible, ought to see for himself what he is told. This can, of course, be pushed to an extreme, but great moderation is exercised in this respect in our schools of

science, and only what is considered to be necessary to the proper understanding of the subject in hand is shown.

5. The outcry against vivisection is due to an unreasonable, though popular, moral prejudice, for we find that though rat-catching, deer-stalking, battue-shooting, and other forms of useless cruelty are tolerated, yet vivisection is condemned, although it seldom inflicts half the pain and terror, and accomplishes so much for the good both of men and animals.

6. To call in question the motives of those who practise vivisection is unfair, and becomes absurd when we think of some of the eminent and humane men of science accused.

7. Vivisection is justified in its results, which have been the occasion of the removal of an immense amount of pain and disease from the world.

REFERENCES :—

- Report of the Royal Commission on Vivisection*, 1906.
Biological Experimentation, by Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson (Bell, 1896).
Publications of the Research Defence Society (Macmillan, 1908).
The Anti-Vivisection Handbook, by R. S. Wood (Nat. Anti-vivisection Soc., 1915).
Experiments on Animals (Nisbet, 1906); and *For and against Experiments on Animals* (H. R. Lewis, 1912), by Stephen Paget.
Vivisection : a Heartless Science, by the Hon. Stephen Coleridge (John Lane, 1916).
Broken Gods and A Catechism of Vivisection, by E. Berdoe (Son-nenschein, 1903).
Articles : Contemporary Review, vol. lxii. p. 849, 1892. "The Morality of Vivisection." Two Replies, by Ernest Bell. (Against.)
Nineteenth Century, vol. xxxii. p. 804, 1892. "The Morality of Vivisection." (For.) By Victor Horsley and Dr. Osmand Ruffer. And same vol., p. 980 : "The Morality of Vivisection.—A Reply," by Bishop of Manchester.
 "What Animal Experimentation has done for Children," by H. D. Chapin (*Science Monthly*, Jan. 1915).
 Various pamphlets are published by the National Anti-vivisection Society and the Research Defence Society.

SHOULD CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS BE TOLERATED IN TIME OF WAR ?

YES

Conscientious Objectors contend that all war whether aggressive or defensive is a violation of the essential teaching of Christianity. A Christian nation is not justified in forcing any of its members to violate his Christian principles by an indiscriminating conscription law. They are not setting up their own private judgment against that of the whole nation, but are merely insisting on being allowed to act in accordance with the recognized religion of the country. Their private conscience might be mistaken, but the dictates of the Christian conscience have a weightier validity than even universal national opinion. The fact that they enjoy the benefits conferred on all its members by the State cannot rightly be urged as an inducement for them to act contrary to the plain teachings of the State religion. They support their contention that all war is unchristian by the following arguments :—

1. Christ taught the brotherhood of men. Christianity is a religion of amity, of love ; clearly, then, war is opposed to the spirit of Christianity, the very antithesis of the teaching of Christ.

2. Christ came to save men, body and soul, while the genius of war is destruction and death. War arises from the antagonisms of rival kingdoms ; but the kingdom of

God, by uniting all men, would make war for ever impossible.

3. Emerson says, "that the power of love as a basis^a of states has never been tried." If it were tried, Christianity would become a fact in the world and not merely an ideal, with the inevitable result that all war would cease.

4. It is said that the teaching of Christ contains no express condemnation of war as a factor in the development of the race ; but it is only necessary to reply to this sort of reasoning that "polygamy," "slavery," "capital punishment," and other countless evil practices have been defended on the same ground of the silence of Scripture. Christ must have been under great temptation at various crises in His career to resort to arms, and He had only to say the word, and the people would have made Him King and followed Him to battle against the Romans ; but He always refused and pointed out most clearly that the kingdom He came to found was essentially a peaceful one, and could not condescend to use war.

5. The power of Christianity was most vividly shown in the reign of Nero, when the Christians submitted themselves to the lions ; and whenever men have taken the sword whether to persecute or to fight, then have they proved false to the religion of Christ.

6. The noble uses of war are advanced in its favour—the courage, devotion to duty and self-sacrifice to which it gives rise. These are not denied, but it is denied that war is the only means of developing these virtues, or even the best means. "Is it so difficult to kill with musket and sword, and is overcoming evil with good so easy and ignoble that we must needs turn the world into a battle-field?"

7. It is claimed that war has set wrongs right, has expelled slavery from the Southern States, has crushed despotism, established liberty, and quickened progress ; but this only shows that it is not an unmixed evil. If against these good

results of some wars we set the evils of all wars,—the hatred, the envy and revenge, the maiming and butchering, the hot-blooded outrages, the sorrow, bereavement, and pain,—we see that war is self-condemned, and when brought face to face with Christ's teaching cannot be defended.

8. When it is contended that war is necessary, it is only needful to remember that nearly every injustice and inhumanity that has existed in the world has been defended on this ground: reformers have been called visionaries, their reforms impracticable, and the evil they wished to reform necessary. As an instance of this, we have only to remember how it was said that if the Factory Acts were passed the commerce of the country would be ruined—an argument which proved to be an illogicality of selfishness. War is no more necessary than tyranny, and the Christian spirit can have no dealings with organized butchery.

NO

Since the development of the national conscience in the slow course of our history, the value of the individual conscience has greatly diminished, especially as this latter is so liable to error from conceit, bigotry, cowardice or sheer wrong-headedness. As Pascal says, "One never does wrong so gaily as when one is doing it for conscience sake." The national conscience in time of war should not tolerate the aberrations of the individual conscience. Socrates argued the whole question out centuries ago and did not attempt to evade the drinking of the hemlock. Whatever may be said about war in general a purely defensive war must be excepted, or else why does the conscientious objector not willingly surrender his property to the first criminal who demands it? The objector enjoys the benefits conferred by the State, it is just therefore that he should

be forced to defend it in time of war. The contention that all war is unchristian may be met in detail as follows :—

1. The final effect of the spirit of Christianity must be the abolition of war, but that does not by any means prove that Christianity forbids war.

2. When Christ uttered the parable of the leaven, He showed the vital principle on which He relied for the progress of the world. The change in the world was to be gradual, and evolved with that steadiness which could alone make it permanent. It is clear, then, that Christ regarded the general condemnation of war as at that stage of progress premature, and we have no right to say that He would condemn war even yet.

3. Sayings like this of Emerson's are merely laments that the ideal has not yet been reached. When the ideal is reached, of course war will be out of the question ; but it would require omniscience to say that war does not, under the present imperfect conditions, answer a well-defined purpose in the higher evolution of man, and may not even be necessary as a goad towards the attainment of the ideal.

4. The teaching of Christ contains no express condemnation of war. He must have been familiar with war and its horrors, and it is very significant that He contents Himself with enunciating the great principle of love to God and neighbour, and yet refrains from a more specific condemnation of war. He must have had some deep purpose in this, some special knowledge of the grim mission of war.

5. If all Christians had adopted the same line of conduct as those under Nero, and had refused to take the sword, and submitted, the result would have been that liberty, progress and civilization would have been held back and even made impossible. Hampden and Cromwell would

not have fought, the power of Spain and the Pope would not have been broken, and we should have had no Waterloo. We cannot suppose that the deeds of which we as a nation are most proud are anti-Christian, or that the mighty deeds of our greatest men were pagan.

6. If war is looked at in detail, it is murder ; but when looked at in its larger aspects it is sacrifice. The effects of war have often been to purify a nation. The War of Independence so invigorated the United States, so stirred within them the spirit of manly independence, that in an incredibly short space of time they took their place among the great powers of the world. When there are so many elements of the highest moral value in war, we cannot say that it is to be entirely condemned in the present state of the race, even on Christian principles.

7. The great moral ideals which underlie a soldier's life are sacrifice and duty, and these must produce nobility of character. It is the story of heroic deeds that stirs the blood of men and makes them capable of sacrifice ; and when war calls forth these great qualities, it cannot be said to be entirely at variance with Christianity.

8. It is the creed of narrow materialism and the practice of luxury which make men unwilling for war now a days. Christianity shows us that life must be sacrificed in order that it may be gained—that death is not the chief evil, or, indeed, an evil at all. It is materialism that revolts from death and refuses to bear pain ; but Christianity recognizes that men must be ready to face death in some causes, and must be prepared to drink the cup of pain to the very dregs for the sake of justice and truth.

REFERENCES :—

- I appeal unto Cæsar*, by Margaret Hobhouse (1917).
For Conscience Sake, by Alfred Bishop (1917).
Prisoners of Hope, by Arthur S. Peake (1918).

The Men who Dared, by Stanley B. James (1917).

The Diary of a Dead Officer (Allen & Unwin, 1919, 5s.).

From Warfare to Welfare, by R. Dimsdale Stocker.

Articles: "The Bible and the C.O.," by T. Rhonda Williams, in *The Nation*, Dec. 30, 1916. "Can a Catholic be a C.O.?" in *The Month* for June and July, 1916. "Conscientious Objectors," by F. G. Gould, in *The Positivist Review*, May, 1916. "Conscience and the C.O.," by J. E. C. Welldon, in *The Nineteenth Century*, May, 1916. "The Fallacy of Non-resistance," by F. W. Orde Ward, in *The Quarterly Review* (London), Jan. 1916.

SHOULD THE WORK OF THE CLERGY BE PUT ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS ?

YES

1. The clergy claim that their calling is a special and sacred one, and they emphasize this by wearing a special dress and styling themselves " Reverend " or even " Very Reverend " : yet, on the other hand, they want to be paid, and often very well paid, for discharging their special and sacred functions. This glaring anomaly cannot go on. The great principle must be accepted that no money should be paid for distinctively religious service, for it is, and must be, from its very nature, voluntary.

2. The attempt to justify modern clerical incomes by texts quoted out of their connections and strained to the bursting of their plain sense is now not only futile, but even ludicrous. The clergy claim to be the representatives of Christ or His disciples : yet neither He nor they were paid.

3. The money taint is on all our religion to-day and our churches are too often run like businesses. The suspicion and even hostility with which the majority of the public regard the clergy arises from the fact that the clergy make their living out of religion, and that, therefore, their motives are suspect, as well as their pulpit declarations, because their income depends on their making the expression of their views agree with the current tradition of orthodoxy.

4. The objection to this principle is its alleged impracticability which arises mainly from the fact that no serious effort has been made to solve the problems connected with its adoption. After a considerable and very salutary reduction in the number of churches and services, the necessary clergy would be drawn from the following classes :—

- (a) Men of independent means who, after due qualification, would devote themselves to this service.
- (b) Men who, after due qualification, would enter commercial life in order to make a competence, so that they might later on be able to devote themselves to this service.
- (c) Duly qualified men who, though engaged in business during the week, would be ready to volunteer for occasional service.
- (d) The clergy might also be recruited from the ranks of duly qualified women.

In many cases it would probably be necessary for a church to have several voluntary clergy attached to it. This would be only an advantage.

5. At present, the prospect of a career induces many men to enter the Church from interested motives. This scandal would be removed if the service were to be voluntary, and only the very best men would be attracted to it. Under present circumstances, the graduate of one of our Universities, when deciding on a profession, is often reduced practically to a choice between becoming a school-master or a parson, and nine times out of ten, he chooses to become a parson, because the prospects are better, or because he has a chance of being presented with a living. If the clergy are not manifestly disinterested, their exhortations must either be met with a dubious shrug of the shoulders, or not be listened to at all.

6. Clerical professionalism separates more than anything else the clergy and the laity. The relationship between the clergy and the people becomes unnatural. Pastoral visits are impossibly uncomfortable : the visited feels that the parson is trying to do him good : and the parson himself feels in a most difficult and delicate position, for there is no basis of human friendship in the matter.

7. Under a voluntary system, the question of celibacy could be left to the individual. Many of the clergy would choose celibacy voluntarily, so as to be able to do the work better, while others would find that they did not require to sacrifice family life. The people would thus have the great advantage of a devoted celibate service, without the evils attached to a compulsory celibacy of the clergy.

8. In any case, the present situation is impossible. The masses regard the clergy as an unproductive class, supported by the labour of others, while the classes look on them with cold and suspicious indifference. All this hostile feeling, which persists in spite of many cases of self-sacrificing devotion on the part of individual clergy, arises from the one deeply-rooted conviction that it is not and cannot be right, under any circumstances, to make money out of religion.

NO

1. This is one of those Utopian schemes which only look well on paper. The clergy are professional gentlemen specially trained for their essential work, and why should they be denied a reasonable remuneration ?

2. Conditions have changed entirely since the time of Christ and what was possible for the early apostles would be quite impossible under modern conditions. This is a question of common sense and not of straining texts.

3. There are a few anomalous cases where a clergyman is

in receipt of a salary either excessive in itself or out of all proportion to the work done, but there are far more cases where the clergyman does not even get enough to support life on. All these inequalities and injustices are now receiving the attention of the Church authorities with a view to their removal. Popular suspicion of and hostility to the clergy does not arise from the fact that they are paid for their work, but from the fact that they still cling officially to worn out forms of creed in spite of the fact that their own views have advanced far beyond them.

4. This scheme would not work. Under present conditions there is plenty of opportunity for voluntary workers, but they do not come forward. If the clergy were not paid there would soon be no more clergy. Voluntary work is never reliable nor sustained.

5. There are unworthy members of every profession. Human motives are so mixed that it is often very difficult for a man to analyse even his own reasons for a course of action. An average clergyman's life is far from presenting a very attractive prospect under modern conditions and there are few really successful clergymen who could not have done much better for themselves financially by entering almost any other line of life.

6. There are undoubtedly great difficulties in the clerical profession as well as in any other—difficulties which can only be overcome by skill and by tact. It is no use blaming "professionalism," because if there were no profession there would be no clergy.

7. The celibacy of the clergy has been thoroughly experimented with in the course of history and in this country at least we think the evils of the system are much greater than its advantages. Experience has convinced us that we are better served by a clergy who are free to marry and are thus in a much better position to understand

the real problems of life with which they have to deal.

8. It is a very dangerous line of argument to enunciate a general truth and then insist upon its practical application, whatever the consequences may be. The difficulty in the present question is to find the best practical line of action and this can only be found by a compromise. Clerical salaries require both levelling up and levelling down, and the sound sense of the Church is sure to find some practical solution to present anomalies, which of course cannot be allowed to continue in a time of general reconstruction.

REFERENCES :—

Old Creeds and New Faith, by C. Delisle Burns (Francis Griffith, 1911).

Churches in the Modern State, by J. N. Figgis (Longmans, 1913).

The Heart of the Empire : a symposium ; chap. vii. "The Church and the People," by F. W. Head (Fisher Unwin, 1901).

Interpretations and Forecasts, by Victor Branford (Duckworth, 1914).

The Making of a Minister, by T. S. Cairncross (Clarke, 1914).

My Priesthood, by W. J. Carey (Longmans, 1915).

The Priest : his Character and Work, by J. Keatinge (Kegan Paul, 1914).

The S.P.C.K. publishes various pamphlets on Church Finance by E. Grose Hodge, the Rev. H. Coombes, and other writers.

SHOULD THE "UNFIT" BE RESTRAINED FROM PARENTHOOD

YES

1. Modern researches in heredity prove that some of the worst radical poisons and defects are handed on from parent to children. If only the insane, feeble-minded, criminal and alcoholic could be restrained from bringing into the world unhappy children, weighed down from their very birth with their parents' unfitness, a long step would be taken towards the permanent betterment of the world. This restraint might with advantage be extended to deaf-mutes and habitual drug-takers, as well as those suffering from heritable diseases.

2. We must distinguish between the right to live and the right to become a parent. Eugenics is really the discouragement of unworthy parenthood. The present effect of the law of "the survival of the fittest" leads to an immense mortality among infants. Why not avoid this by regulating parenthood? The proposal is constructive, as opposed to the present destructive working of natural law.

3. We are forced to abandon the idea of raising any special "stocks," because any stock will contain sharply contrasted individuals of vastly different growth: but if we can only raise the average we shall have done much. Preventive eugenics should be our only aim in the meantime.

4. The imperative need of this reform is seen alone from the fact that in our asylums a great many "cures" are effected. These people are released, because they are no longer technically insane, but under outside conditions the old insanity mostly revives and they are allowed to pass it on to their children unrestrained.

5. In Great Britain alone we have 200,000 deaf mutes. This defect is almost certainly hereditary. More research is wanted, but as soon as any defect of this kind is proved to be hereditary it is not only foolish but positively criminal not to take steps to eradicate the scourge.

6. Undiscriminating demands for an increase in the birth-rate are very foolish, for it is not mere numbers we want, but a better race, freed as far as possible from avoidable hereditary taint. Eugenics aims at quality rather than quantity. "These bewailings about our mercifully falling birth-rate, uncoupled with any attention to the slaughter of the children actually born are pitiable in their blindness, and would be lamentable if they had any effect—of which there is fortunately no sign whatever, but indeed the contrary."—*Dr. Saleeby*.

7. Eugenic knowledge should be spread. The object is not to elevate the race by destroying the unfit at any stage, ante-natal or post-natal, but by preventing the conception of the unfit. If only women were free to choose their mates unfettered by monetary considerations a great advance would be made. "It seemed to me then that to prevent the multiplication of people below a certain standard, and to encourage the multiplication of exceptionally superior people, was the only real and permanent way of mending the ills of the world. I think that still."—*H. G. Wells*.

NO

1. The whole subject of heredity is still under scientific investigation. It is remarkable how often parents with some "taint" or other have very healthy children. Even slum children are often robust and fit. The question is still far too obscure to justify any restraint of parenthood.

2. The proposal is an unjustifiable interference with the liberty of the subject. Any conceivable legislation would be most tyrannous in its effects, and would not be tolerated in any free country.

3. You cannot "breed" human beings as you can horses. The higher you get in the scale of life the more complicated and difficult become the problems of heredity, until in human beings any reliable calculation seems out of the question.

4. It is always possible to advocate any proposed "reform" by citing an extreme case which it would meet. We do not legislate however for extreme and exceptional cases, but for the common good. In general this proposal certainly would not work, and it would raise more difficulties than it would solve.

5. Science has not yet been able to pronounce upon the question whether the defect of deaf mutes is hereditary or not. Even if it should turn out to be really hereditary we could not prevent deaf mutes from parenthood, without resorting to impossibly draconic measures.

6. Our falling birth-rate is one of the most alarming signs of the times. No nation can long survive whose birth-rate falls below a certain level. At such a crisis in our national life and after a devastating war it is proposed to reduce our birth-rate still further by all sorts of Utopian eugenic legislation!

7. "Eugenics" has often been used as an agent of class prejudice, an argument against love, a reason for cruel and

wicked surgical operations, for defending the neglect of infancy and for wild talk about lethal chambers and stud-farms." "Fitness" is far more a question of environment than one of birth.

REFERENCES :

Galton's *Essays on Eugenics*.

Problems of Sex (Cassell, 1912) and *Sex* (Home University Library, 1914), by Patrick Geddes and J. A. Thomson.

The Problem of Race Regeneration (Cassell, 1911); *The Task of Social Hygiene* (Constable, 1912); and *Essays in War-Time* (Constable, 1916), by Havelock Ellis.

Parenthood and Race Culture (Cassell, 1909); *Methods of Race Regeneration* (Cassell, 1911); and *The Progress of Eugenics* (Cassell, 1914), by Dr. C. W. Saleeby.

Race Culture, or Race Suicide? by R. R. Rentoul (Walter Scott, 1906).

Marriage and Disease: a doctor's scientific symposium (Rebman, 1907).

The Ordeal of Richard Feverel, by George Meredith.

Three Plays by Brieux, with Introduction by G. Bernard Shaw (Fifield).

SYNDICALISM

FOR

1. The present capitalist system is aimed at the exploitation of labour. Although conditions may improve from time to time, this is not because of the present system but in spite of it. It is necessary to destroy the system that labour may control the products of labour.

2. Political action has been tried and found wanting. Parliament was founded by the middle classes in their own interest, and it is their interest to exploit the workers. Even working-class representatives are untrustworthy, as they are inevitably drawn into the vortex of log rolling and dishonesty which is political life. If parliament, after endless delay, does finally pass a measure to improve the conditions of labour, capitalism will always contrive by evasion, judicial decisions, or some such means to nullify its effect.

3. There remains only the syndicalist alternative of "direct action." By the general strike society can be paralysed and compelled to accept the just terms which labour will dictate.

4. Violence is not a part of the syndicalist programme. "Sabotage" in its subtler sense is perfectly justifiable. "*A mauvaise paie, mauvais travail.*"

5. Syndicalism, it is true, may never succeed in bringing about the millennium. But it is none the less useful, since it provides the workers with an ideal, without which

men sink into indifference, and it carries on a ceaseless campaign which brings the attainment of that ideal nearer. The Syndicalist acts, the politician talks.

AGAINST

1. The interests of capital and labour are not opposed, but identical. Classes are not antagonistic, but interdependent. Revolution is in itself harmful. The loss to production entailed thereby sets back the march of progress out of all proportion to the benefits gained.

2. It is admitted that industrial organization and pressure is necessary to social progress ; but it must be combined with political action. Political industrialism is the *via media* of safety. The danger of unfair interpretation of acts of parliament is thus met. Syndicalism only succeeds in driving moderate men to the party of reaction, since at all costs society must defend itself.

3. (See the Debate on strikes.) The general strike is a delusion. Its impracticability has been demonstrated notably in Sweden. Time fights against the general strike, since the workers themselves are the first to feel the pinch.

4. Violence, even if not at first intended, is bound to ensue, for starving men are driven to it. Damage to machinery, deliberate bad work, and such forms of sabotage are injurious to the workers as much as to employers, and are besides degrading to the national character.

5. " Their old men shall see visions and their young men shall dream dreams." Syndicalism is indeed an ideal. It is a myth which deludes the ignorant and prevents them from pursuing the true path of progress, that of increased production for the benefit of all.

REFERENCES :—

- Syndicalism*, by J. H. Harley (Jack's Peoples' Books, 1912).
Socialism and Syndicalism, by Philip Snowden (Collins, 1913).

Syndicalism, by J. Ramsay McDonald (Constable, 1912).

Syndicalism and the General Strike, by Arthur D. Lewis (Fisher Unwin, 1912).

Syndicalism and Labour, by Arthur Clay (Murray, 1911).

Democracy at the Crossways, by F. J. C. Hernshaw (Macmillan, 1918).

Article : "The Triple Alliance of Labour," by G. R. Garter (*Economic Journal*, Sept. 1916).

IS THE CINEMA A DEGENERATING AMUSEMENT ?

YES

1. Parents exercise a certain discrimination, when their children want to go to the theatre, with regard to the character of the play they are going to see : but there is no such care concerning the Cinema. In fact the frequent change of programme makes discrimination almost impossible. The result is that unripe minds are degenerated by having dramas and problems presented to them, with which they have not sufficient experience to deal.

2. More and more the Cinema depends for its popularity on pure sensationalism. Sensational literature is bad enough, but sensational pictures are far worse, because more vivid. The whole range of human passion is acted out before young eyes before they have gained any real understanding of the meaning of life. The first effect is an unhealthy over-excitement, while the second is an equally regrettable reaction, which blunts the over-stimulated sympathies and makes the whole mind jaded and callous.

3. Though the film plays are generally so arranged that virtue triumphs in the end, nevertheless the real moral is mostly bad. The sympathy goes with the criminal. Vice is depicted in gaudy surroundings, righteousness does not seem to pay, and luck is worth more than perseverance—these are only some of the degenerating implications of the Cinema.

4. Crime stories and serials exert a pernicious power of suggestion on the minds of boys. " In a London suburb

recently, a policeman informed the Bench that a boy's ingenious plan of breaking into a shop was directly taken from the local films." This kind of thing occurs quite frequently enough to demonstrate the fact that the Cinema does exert a degenerating influence.

5. The Cinema might be made of great educational value if pictures were shown which would rouse interest in certain branches of science and industry, but unfortunately the Cinema is a purely commercial undertaking, and the consequence is that most of the pictures shown are artificial, meretricious, untrue to life, false in sentiment, hectic and exaggerated. Young people would be much better in the open air than looking at these inconsequent pictures. " 'There is no wealth but life,' and these plays are vitiating that life, physical, intellectual and moral, at the very source."

NO

1. The appeal of the Cinema is as universal as that of the Stage: it is not meant for young people alone. If all novels were written for "the young person" they would cease to be interesting: it is exactly the same with films. The young develop nowadays much more quickly than in the old time, and nothing is shown on the screen that can really do any harm.

2. This same charge of sensationalism was hurled at the modern novel, when it began to make its wide appeal. It is based on the old-fashioned, false identification of virtue with innocence. Young people are not hot-house plants. A little healthy excitement does not do them any harm, especially in view of the fact that their work is usually monotonous and uninteresting. To stimulate the mind, to show it some of the colour, richness and variety of life will not degenerate it.

3. The censorship will not pass any film which conveys a bad moral. If evil were not shown the picture would not be true, but good always triumphs in the end. In fact so generally is this the case that it might be criticized as untrue to life. The moral ending in the film is becoming as inartistic as the happy ending in the novel.

4. These stories of boys incited to crime by the Cinema are becoming ridiculous. Any boy brought up before the Magistrate for a delinquency is delighted to make the Cinema an excuse for his fault. We never hear of the boys who have been effectively warned from a career of crime by the films, nor of the girls who have been stimulated to some real heroism in their life by some example they have seen on the screen.

5. The Cinema is still in its youth. It is a commercial undertaking and must be made to pay. Scientific films do not pay any more than novels with a purpose. The Cinema is an amusement and not a Board-school. The Picture Palace is the poor man's theatre. He goes to be amused and recreated after a tiring and dreary day's work. The great success of the films shows that they fulfil their purpose and in the main the effect is good.

REFERENCES:—

- The Cinema; its Present Position and Future*: Report of the Cinema Commission of Inquiry (Williams & Norgate, 1917).
Cinema Acting as a Profession (Charisse & Sons, 1915).
Life and Labour in London (Final Vol. Part ii, "Amusements"), by Charles Booth (Macmillan, 1903).
Cinema Plays and How to Write Them, by E. H. Bell (Stanley Paul, 1919).
 Articles: "The Cinema and Child Welfare," by H. McNaughton Jones (*The Child*, April, 1916). "Children and Picture Palaces," by E. M. Fox (*Parents' Review*, Sept. 1916). "The Educational Kinema," by A. R. Williams (*Journal of Education*, Nov. 1915). *The Times* "Educational Supplement" of Jan., 1915, and Oct. 12, 1916. "The Child and the Cinematograph Show," by Canon Rawnsley and the Headmaster of Eton (*Hibbert Journal*, July, 1913).

IS THE WORLD GROWING BETTER ?

YES

1. That the watchword of this age is humanity is exemplified in many different ways :—

- (a) Far greater thought is now given to the care of the weak and the old. Hospitals and homes have increased enormously, their administration has improved, and the public is liberal in their support.
- (b) Children are now protected by Act of Parliament and public opinion in a way that would have been inconceivable a century ago. The age of labour is being raised, and the cruelty of parents or employers is now hampered by effective legislation.
- (c) The status of women is higher ; their rights with respect to their children and their property are more fully recognized, and their lot is marked by greater freedom and less brutality than formerly.
- (d) The efforts on behalf of the poorer classes were never so many nor so far-reaching. All sects and all ranks join in the endeavour to root out the miseries of poverty.
- (e) In spite of the fact that the whole world has been scourged by the most fearful war of all history, nevertheless the war was waged by the allies for the most part for the sake of high ideals, such as

the protection of small nations from brutal aggression, the sanctity of treaties and the like. The war has shown that the spirit of noble patriotism and unhesitating self-sacrifice is much more general now than it used to be.

(f) The law is not now the brutal instrument it once was. The great principle that punishments are preventive and reformatory is now recognized, and much is done to prevent crime and to rescue the criminal.

2. The ever sharpening criticism of our Churches and the constantly falling attendance at religious services are not signs of degeneration of the religious sense, but rather the reverse. The people feel that our official religion has encased itself in worn-out formulæ, that it is trying vainly to deliver its message through the medium of mediæval thought. It is just because the world is growing better that there is this stern demand for more reality in religion, both in thought and worship and humanitarian service.

3. The world is a more enlightened place, and this enlightenment is spreading with a never-increasing rapidity.

(a) Superstition is dying out, and with it the cruelty and the narrowness always attendant upon it.

(b) The progress of science has done wonders to alleviate pain, to cure disease, and to enable men to live healthier and therefore more righteous lives.

(c) Education is now within the reach of all, and the civilizing effects of this are already visible.

(d) The progress of invention has made the world a more comfortable place. There are so many labour-saving machines that life is rendered less toilsome than formerly.

4. The world is more wide awake, more industrious, more exacting.

- (a) The power of despotism is dying out everywhere.
- (b) The workers are demanding an adequate share of the fruit of their labour.
- (c) It has become a disgrace to be an idle drone.
- (d) Class distinctions are being broken down, and the time is presumably nearer when "Man to man the world o'er shall brithers be for a' that."

NO

1. That there is so much philanthropic work going on now only means that our social system is in such a rotten condition that only by these efforts can disaster be staved off. Even the efforts that are made are inadequate.

- (a) Take, for example, the treatment of old age in a rich country like England. It is too often possible for neglect and starvation to be the reward of industrious and honest lives. The recipient of relief is branded in the eyes of the more fortunate.
- (b) If modern life has secured some immunities for children, it has arranged for them cruelties of its own. Trafficking in children's lives and in their labour is a reality in all great cities, and the feeble efforts of legislation hardly touch this evil.
- (c) Many of the laws affecting women, and through them the heart of society, are still as brutal as ever. Modern life presses with peculiar hardness upon women. The greater freedom allowed them is not an unmixed blessing. The overtaking of their strength will probably result in the deterioration of the race, and their entering the lists with men has caused serious complications in the labour world, making the struggle for bare existence almost unendurable.
- (d) The efforts on behalf of the poor are unintelligent

and misdirected. They are not co-operative. They both overlap and fall short. They help to increase rather than to diminish poverty ; so much so that an alarming proportion of the poor are already hopelessly pauperized.

- (e) Wars have steadily increased in senseless savagery and destruction until the great world war put all other wars out of comparison. Millions of lives have been sacrificed to national greed and lust for power. The youth of the world has been sacrificed to Moloch, and we still say the world is growing better. After more than 1800 years of Christianity the foundations of civilization are shaken by the most awful crime of history, committed by the most highly civilized nation in Europe—yet we think it possible to raise the question, is the world growing better ?

2. Religion as a living force is weak. Preaching is rapidly losing its influence, Church membership is becoming a mere form, and Church services are in many cases only respectable hypocrisy. An increasing number of the best men in the country will have nothing to do with the Churches. The efforts at the union of the Churches evaporate in exhaustless talk and missionary enterprise is very often quite unintelligent and futile.

3. Modern progress and enlightenment, so called, are full of conceit and ignorance of earlier efforts. Increase of knowledge has only meant increase of sorrow, and the burden of the world's pain grows every year.

- (a) If some old superstitions have died out, other cruel ones have grown up : the sanctity of competition, for instance.

- (b) Prolonging human life is often a doubtful gain. As modern life has created many new dangers and

disasters, the effect of scientific achievements is, so to speak, cancelled.

(c) Education is groping in the dark. Children are not trained for life ; and, indeed, to train them for this blinding whirl called modern life would be impossible. The sects have made education their chosen battle-field, and the present state of education in England would be comic, if it were not so sad.

(d) Cinematographs and wireless telegraphy are not likely to bring about the salvation of the world, and are a poor compensation for the healthy outdoor lives which a large proportion of our forefathers led.

4. The world is more restless ; but it is the restlessness of fever. Beneath all its activity and gaiety the world carries a weary heart.

(a) We are only exchanging the rule of tyrants for the rule of mobs ; and as tyrants are sometimes enlightened, and mobs never are, the change is for the worse.

(b) The present discontents are not Divine, but a proof that the times are out of joint.

(c) A contemplative life is becoming impossible, and yet the burdens and the rewards of labour are very unequally distributed.

(d) Class strife is becoming more ruinous and more inhuman.

(e) Modern civilization has created new crimes, yet it has not scientifically attempted the cure of crime. Our prison system is based upon a wrong principle, being punitive and not reformative ; and such is the general indifference on the subject that rational reform is almost out of the question, and abuses prevail unchecked.

REFERENCES :—

- The Wonderful Century*, by Alfred Russell Wallace (Sonnenschein, 1903).
- Studies in Pessimism*, by A. Schopenhauer.
- The God which is Man* (Griffiths, 1912); and *The Time Spirit* (Erskine McDonald, 1913), by R. Dimsdale Stocker.
- Pessimism*, by James Sully (Kegan Paul, 1891), contains a bibliography.
- The Living Past* (1915) and *The Century of Hope* (1919), by F. S. Marvin (Oxford Univ. Press).
- Modern Morality and Modern Toleration*, by E. S. P. Haynes (Watts, 1912).
- Aspects of Pessimism*, by R. M. Wenley (Blackwood, 1894).
- The Romance of Medicine*, by Ronald McFie (Cassell, 1907).
- History of Intellectual Development*, by John Beattie-Crozier (Longmans, 1902).
- Pessimism, Science, and God*, by John Page Hopps (Williams & Norgate, 1894).
- The Emancipation of English Women*, by W. Lyon Blease (Nutt, 1913).
- The Bible in Europe* (Watts, 1907) and *A Tyranny of Shams* (Eveleigh Nash, 1916), by Joseph McCabe.
- The Man-made World*, by C. P. Gilman (Fisher Unwin, 1911).
- The Heart of the Empire*: a symposium; chap. ix. "The Past and the Future," by G. M. Trevelyan (Fisher Unwin, 1901).
- The Golden Bough*, by Sir J. G. Frazer.

LOCAL VETO

FOR

1. Drunkenness is admitted to be our chief national curse, and calls for stringent measures to mitigate its ravages. Inasmuch as it notoriously increases the rates as well as injures the morals of every district in England, the inhabitants in each district ought to be allowed to protect themselves, by having power to prohibit or limit the common sale of intoxicating liquors.

2. For this purpose nothing will be effective, except a direct popular vote on the question. If town and county councils were to control the liquor traffic, all local elections would become hopelessly complicated and inflamed by this issue, to the prejudice and confusion of every other local interest. Moreover on such a vital matter the popular will should express itself directly and distinctly.

3. Existing councils, especially in counties, cover wide areas and embrace great diversities of population. Each locality should have the power to decide for itself on this important point, by giving a direct popular vote on the question of "license," "no license," or "number of licenses."

4. A special *referendum* vote is already provided for in regard to free libraries, etc., and casts no reflection on local representative bodies.

5. The "tyranny" of a majority which was ascertained

in this manner would be far less oppressive than the tyranny of a bench of irremovable magistrates, or even of an elected council. For in the case of local veto it is not proposed that prohibition be carried out except by the will of a considerable majority (many advocate two-thirds of those who vote). At present, an individual landowner can, and in not a few cases does, exercise unrestricted power of prohibition over extensive estates, with beneficent results.

6. In many British colonies, and in the United States, the ratepayers already possess practical power to prohibit the sale of intoxicants, and where they have exercised this power—*e.g.* in the State of Maine, U.S.A.—the social improvement has been conspicuous.

AGAINST

1. It is distinctly unjust for a majority of citizens to have power to deprive a minority of their right to purchase and use alcoholic liquor, on the ground that some men abuse this liberty.

2. "I had rather see England free than England sober."
—*Archbishop Magee*.

3. It is inconsistent to forbid the public sale of an article, while the State permits it to be manufactured, imported, owned, and consumed by individuals.

4. It is illogical for the State to allow a trade to be prohibited in one parish and to be licensed in the rest, by the chance vote of local ratepayers. The liquor traffic is a national, not a parochial question.

5. Those districts where restrictions are most needed would certainly be least likely to vote for them. If, however, the liquor trade were controlled by representative bodies extending over considerable areas, far better results would be secured.

6. For the popular will to act by mass votes, really con-

tradicts and subverts the idea of representative government.

7. If alcohol were forbidden in one district and tolerated in a district adjacent, the object of Local Veto would be defeated, while the latter district would be seriously injured.

8. Experience in other countries, including the State of Maine, proves that prohibitive laws are extensively evaded and often inoperative. They lead to bogus clubs (which are far harder to control than public-houses) and to the illicit sale and consumption of liquor.

9. If the ratepayers in a parish may forbid any trade or calling which they dislike, while it remains lawful elsewhere, why should they not have the right to suppress unpopular places of religious or political resort? To concede a local veto on alcohol would eventually injure the cause of civic and religious liberty.

10. Such a veto must necessarily be subject to periodical revision, and this would breed ceaseless agitation and strife. A hasty vote would be followed by violent reaction, and real temperance reform would be further off than ever.

11. The injustice of local veto would inflict special hardship on working men. The public-house is often their only club, and they cannot afford to stock their own cellars.

REFERENCES :—

- The History of Liquor Licensing in England*, by S. and B. Webb (Longmans, 1903).
The Policy of Licensing Justices (1909), and *The Tied-House System* (1910), by Edwin A. Pratt (P. S. King).
The Whole Armour of Man, by C. W. Saleeby (Grant Richards, 1919).
The Licensing Acts, by James Paterson (Butterworth, 1917).
The Temperance Problem and Social Reform, by Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell; chaps. iii. and iv. (Hodder & Stoughton, 1901).
Life and Labour in London (Final Volume, Part II. "Public Houses and Licensing"), by Charles Booth (Macmillan, 1903).

The Heart of the Empire : a symposium ; chap. iv. (Fisher Unwin, 1901).

Socialism and the Drink Question, by Philip Snowden (Socialist Library, 1908).

Facts and Figures for the Temperance Campaign, by Henry Carter (Methodist Publishing House, 1907).

Article : "Scientific Temperance," by Dr. C. W. Saleeby (*Contemporary Review*, Dec. 1918).

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

FOR

1. This question is quite clear on ethical grounds. Work is work whether it is done by a man or a woman and if the same amount of work is done the same pay should be given.

2. It is not just to pay the man more on the supposition that he has to support the family, while the woman only has to support herself, because as a matter of fact it is found that it is just the contribution of the wife and daughters which makes it possible for the whole family to live. Statistics in a certain group of industries showed that the maximum contributed by the fathers to the family income was 56 per cent. while the maximum contributed by daughters of 16 years of age and over was 46.6 per cent.

3. Women are not forcing themselves into work out of distaste for home duties, but from sheer necessity, for the family life cannot be maintained without their help.

4. Opposition to this great principle is founded on the outworn superstition that women are inferior to men as workers. The war has dispelled this illusion, demonstrating in numberless cases that not only do women work more efficiently than men, but are at the same time keener and more willing, adaptable and intelligent.

5. Unless this principle is conceded women will underbid men, with the result that wages will fall and the general wretchedness become much worse even than it is at present.

AGAINST

1. This proposition may seem sound ethically, but its practical application works out disastrously in the long run.

2. If the fact that in most cases the man has to support his wife and family is left out of account, just because the other members of the family often help him, the only result can be to discourage men from marriage. Equal pay means in short the break up of the family, ultimately.

3. If daughters must work it simply proves that men's wages are not sufficient to allow a family. The conclusion is obvious—a man must either not marry or not have a family, and both of these courses are disastrous to the State.

4. Under the stimulus of war women have worked as well as men did *in peace*, but it is forgotten that while the women were achieving this, the men were surpassing themselves in the war, most of them doing a day's work which no woman could dream of facing. There is no doubt about the fact that circumstances being equal, a man can do much more work than a woman and should rightly receive higher pay.

5. There are certain jobs suitable for women, and men will have to give these up, but in the main to talk of women as a class underbidding men as a class is nonsense, for there are vast fields of labour unsuited to women where any employer is glad to pay higher wages to get a man for his job.

REFERENCES :—

- Problems of Modern Industry*, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb : chaps. iii., iv. and vi. (Longmans, 1902).
Women's Work and Wages, by Edward Cadbury (Fisher Unwin, 1906).
Equal Pay and the Family : a symposium (Headley, 1918).
The Philosophy of Conflict, by Havelock Ellis (Constable, 1919).
Women and Economics, by C. P. Gilman (Putnam's, 1908).

Women and Labour, by Olive Schreiner (Fisher Unwin, 1911).

The Hope for Society : a symposium (Bell, 1919).

The Emancipation of English Women, by W. Lyon Bleas (Nutt, 1913).

Life and Labour in London, by Charles Booth : Vol. iv., chaps. ix. and x. ; and Vol. v., Part 2 (Macmillan, 1903).

Report of the War Cabinet Committee on Women in Industry (Stationery Office, 1s. 6d., 1919).

Articles : "Equal Pay for Equal Work," by Mrs. Fawcett (*Contemporary Review*, Oct. 1918). *The Englishwoman* published a series of articles on this subject in June 1917, Oct. 1918, Jan. and Mar. 1919.

CLASSICAL *v.* MODERN EDUCATION

CLASSICAL

1. The Greek and Latin languages contain the history of our origins and explain so much in our literature, language and ideals that no education can be called complete which has not included a study of the classics.

2. The classics unfold a literature, art and life which are in themselves of inestimable value. This is demonstrated by the tremendous effect of the rediscovery of these classics at the Renaissance, while the Middle Ages before this great awakening give a vivid picture of what the world became when deprived of the records of classic literature, art and life.

3. Classical literature is full of the key thoughts upon which intellectual life depends. It is a mistake to suppose that their thought is antiquated simply because they knew fewer facts than we. Greek literature has become a standard for the whole world of thought : some acquaintance with it therefore is indispensable.

4. The classics supply a mental discipline and thought gymnastic absolutely necessary in education and not obtainable elsewhere so easily.

5. We dare not cut ourselves off from the two greatest and most influential civilizations on which Europe is built up, nor from two literatures whose completeness and excellence have never been surpassed.

6. The classics supply us with the only really independent and reliable standards by which we can judge our own time.

7. The difficulty many boys find in deriving the real benefit from their classical studies arises from bad methods of teaching. This difficulty should not be advanced as an argument for removing the classics from the school curriculum, but only as an argument in favour of more enlightened methods of teaching the classics.

MODERN

1. That a young man should be familiar with the origins of our literature language and ideals is doubtless important, but it is far more important that he should have some real knowledge of the world in which he lives and of the laws relating to his own existence in it. This he can learn from modern science alone.

2. That classical literature, art and life are valuable is not denied, but it should be manifest that a modern education is indispensable to a modern man. First and foremost the young must be taught what the world is to-day. The purpose of education should be to make our boys and girls into active and useful men and women. A certain number of antiquaries are useful, but a nation of antiquaries will eventually become effete.

3. It is precisely in its method of thought that science is pre-eminent ;—Observation, experiment, working hypothesis, ending in a conclusion, always subject to revision by new facts arising. To acquire this habit of thought should be one of the chief objects of education. A modern education is plainly better fitted for this purpose than a classical one.

4. The mental discipline and thought gymnastic of

science and modern languages is just as good and often better than that of the classics. The vast majority of boys are unable to adjust themselves to the unfavourable environment of the classics : the result being an atmosphere of inattention, idleness and despair. Teach a boy a modern language and you interest him. He sees the practical use of it. He keeps it up. Teach him a dead language and he becomes bored. Even should he become fairly expert in Latin verse, he soon forgets it all. Give young intellects fresh food : not canned goods.

5. We dare not separate our youth too far from the life they will have to live without disaster. An exclusively classical education such as is too often supplied to-day puts youth out of touch with modern life and fosters an intellectual conceit and exclusiveness which can only react on its victim.

6. The classical scholar is not open to new ideas nor adaptable. It is because of the prevalence of this educational system that the nation could not and would not see the growing German menace. The warnings of Lord Roberts fell on deaf ears. When the war began how long it took us to pass conscription, to arrange for a sufficient supply of munitions, to build sufficient aeroplanes and the like ! How interminable were the peace negotiations ! Slow, unadaptable, unprogressive, no grip of a new problem, no decision—this is the national result of generations of classical education.

7. At present we cram the unhappy child with indigestible classics and then apply the " emetic of an examination." A modern education trains the young to think for themselves in the present world in which they live, while a classical education overburdens their memories with facts about remote antiquities and grammar of dead tongues.

REFERENCES :—

- Education*, by Herbert Spencer (Everyman's Library).
Some Thoughts concerning Education, by John Locke.
Education and Empire, by Lord Haldane.
The Psychology of Education, by J. Welton (Macmillan, 1911).
A Defence of Classical Education, R. W. Livingstone (Macmillan, 1916).
Higher Education and the War, by Prof. Burnet (Macmillan, 1917).
Studies in Foreign Education (Harrap, 1913), and *The Teaching of Modern Languages* (Blackie), by Cloudesley Brereton.
Joan and Peter (Cassell, 1918), and *Anticipations* (Chapman & Hall, 1914), by H. G. Wells.
The Loom of Youth, by Alec Waugh (Grant Richards, 1918).
A Dream of Youth, by Martin Browne (Longmans, 1918).
Natural Science Education (Stationery Office, 1s. 6d.).
 Articles : "A Defence of the Modern Humanities," by Cloudesley Brereton (*Nineteenth Century*, April, 1918). "Education in our Public Schools," by C. E. Robinson (*Nineteenth Century*, June, 1917). "The Reconstruction of the Universities," by the Ven. Archdeacon Cunningham (*Contemporary Rev.*, Mar. 1918).

SHALL WE GO BACK TO PROTECTION ?

YES

1. It has become imperative to reconsider our fiscal policy. Great Britain remains the only free-trade nation. All other countries are increasingly protectionist.

2. When we adopted free trade, Britain (as the outcome of her protective policy in the past) was the one great manufacturing nation. The subsequent rapid development of our industries resulted mainly from railroads, telegraphs, ocean steamers, improved machinery and the increased production of gold—all of which new causes began to operate at about the same time.

3. While universal free trade might benefit mankind, we suffer to-day from one-sided free trade. We freely admit imports from all other countries, which shut their markets against us.

4. A protective system promotes diversities of trades and checks over-specialization. A great variety of industries reduces the distress caused by trade depression, inasmuch as all trades are not depressed at once.

5. Under protection a country, or empire, tends to become industrially self-sufficing and independent of other countries—especially in regard to its food supply. It thus avoids what would become a grave national danger to England in time of war.

6. Other countries—and in particular the United States—have grown rich under protection, and are rapidly growing richer under its fostering care. They have successfully challenged England's industrial supremacy. They not only keep their home markets, but increase their exports. We are no longer the workshop of the world. Nations which once bought our manufactures now send us their own manufactures in increasing quantities.

7. While the export trade of the chief protectionist countries is on the up-grade, ours is on the down-grade; with the expansion of the world's commerce it ought to have expanded, whereas at best it is stagnant.

8. Our staple British industries are distinctly declining. In iron and steel manufactured goods our exports show a falling off. Our textile trade does not obtain its share in the world's increasing consumption. Our silk trade is almost destroyed by foreign protected silks. Other industries—like the tin-plate trade—have been literally killed by the American tariff.

9. Our greatest industry—agriculture—on which the physical, moral and economic well-being of the country so vitally depends, has been reduced by free trade to a disastrous condition.

10. Under free trade foreign manufactured goods—which could be well produced in England—flood the English market in ever increasing quantities, ousting our home industries and ruining both masters and workmen by goods “dumped” here below cost price, with which no home producer can compete.

11. When a working man's occupation disappears, his income goes as well, and the State is burdened by crowds of “unemployed.” Under protection, even if working men paid something extra for articles of consumption, they would still be better off, by reason of increased wages and

employment and by being protected against the competition of cheap foreign labour.

12. Under free trade, nearly a quarter of our population remain on the brink of actual want. No greater boon could be conferred on British working people than a fiscal reform which secured every industrious man full and regular work at fair wages.

13. The cost of production in most trades now depends mainly on quantity produced. Hence cheapness depends on demand, that is to say, on the markets open to the producer. A protected manufacturer has two markets open to him, while his free trade competitor has only one. The former can thus (1) by a large output which reduces the cost of production, and (2) by selling in his home market at non-competitive prices, put the balance of his stock on the British market at a price which will finally extinguish his British competitor's trade.

14. A modern State must foster its commercial prosperity and protect its industries that are injured or threatened by foreign competition. At present England is fast becoming a nation of middlemen and consumers: the manufacturer and producer are being crushed out.

15. Protective import duties are paid by the consumer only when there is no competing home industry; where such exists, the duty cannot be added to the price, but is really paid by the foreign importer as a toll for his entrance into our market.

16. Even if protection raised prices and increased the cost of living, profits and wages would increase in proportion, for the country would be more prosperous; and with protection all round, all industries would benefit alike.

17. The immense and increasing divergence between the value of our imports (the goods we buy) and our exports (the goods we sell) is an alarming portent. Making every

allowance for profits, shipping, interest on foreign investments, etc., we are now selling less than we buy ; that is, we are living on our national capital.

18. To tax all imported manufactured goods need not prevent us from still admitting all food and raw material free of duty.

NO

1. Half a century ago England under protection had come to the brink of bankruptcy. Both in agriculture and in commerce the depression was extreme, while pauperism, crime, social distress and discontent had grown to alarming proportions. Our national prosperity began—as it has continued—with free trade, though modern inventions have certainly accelerated its advance.

2. At the present time British industry and commerce show no signs of decay. Our exports for 1902 registered the greatest annual volume of trade ever transacted by any country. In proportion to the population our export of manufactured goods was twice as great as that of pre-war Germany, and six times as great as that of the United States.

3. It is a capital error to leave out of account our home trade, which certainly is five or six times as great as our external trade. Out of a wages bill of from £700,000,000 to £750,000,000 paid in the country each year, the Board of Trade computes that only about £130,000,000 are wages paid in our exporting industries.

4. Our imports of raw materials of manufactures show a steady growth, proving that our total manufactures increase correspondingly. Home consumption more than makes up for any falling off in the foreign demand.

5. Though in its aggregate value our foreign trade showed no great progress before the war, this is explained by the world-wide fall in prices, which masked the fact that our output has largely and steadily advanced in quantity.

6. Our expanding national wealth was evidenced by the returns from every available source. Savings banks, death-duties, income-tax, railways, shipping, all tell the same tale of prosperity and prove that we are not "living on our national capital."

7. Although we have still a lamentable amount of poverty nevertheless, in spite of the submerged tenth, "we are as a whole the best fed, the most regularly employed, and the most highly paid people in Europe." And in the United States, where wages are generally higher still, living costs more and work is more exhausting than in England.

8. The United States has indeed advanced—partly through its energy and enterprise and adaptability—partly because of its magnificent systems of scientific and technical education—but mainly because absolute internal free trade exists among the people in the United States. This latter country is a continent in itself as large as Europe, including all varieties of climate and immeasurable resources of nature.

9. As rival nations multiply and develop their natural advantages, the inhabitants of these small islands cannot possibly retain all their former relative commercial supremacy. Yet by the aid of our free trade we still lead the world, and profit even by the success of our competitors. We still send to protectionist countries in every instance (with the single exception of France), and in the aggregate, a far greater amount of manufactures than they send to us.

10. The alleged decay in the chief British manufactures—such as iron and steel, textiles, silk, and tin-plates—is absolutely contradicted by the statistics of all these trades.

11. We need not throw away the boon of free trade, because other countries reject it. We admit their goods

freely into our markets, not for their benefit but for our own. We thus obtain the materials for our manufactures and the food for our people at the lowest rates. Our shipping trade has grown until we are the carriers of the world. Our ports have become centres for the redistribution abroad of foreign produce. Our capital is the headquarters of the world's banking and finance.

12. The whole of our complicated system of industry and commerce has been gradually evolved under the conditions created by free imports. To reverse these conditions would bring about not merely confusion, but catastrophe. It is painfully difficult for a protectionist people to adopt free trade: it would be ruinous for a free-trade people to turn protectionist.

13. Free trade leaves a country, unhampered by artificial bribes or barriers, to produce just what it is naturally best fitted to produce to economic advantage. Labour and capital have liberty to discover their most profitable enterprises.

14. We insure against industrial crises in proportion as we widen our sources of supply and our area of exchange. Free-trade England has far more diversified industries than any protectionist nation.

15. While protection is powerless to create trade or markets or capital or to increase the total of production, it can divert a certain amount of labour and capital into artificial channels. But even this is only attained by giving assistance to some selected classes of home industry at the expense of all other classes.

16. For "protective import duties are most certainly paid by the importing consumer and not by the exporting producer." The whole community would suffer from an increased cost of living. And even if certain working men obtained higher pay and more employment (neither of

which is admitted) the purchasing power of their wages would sink so that they would be worse off than before.

17. Under a system of protection, each industry will resort to political wire-pulling and corruption in order to increase the tariff in its favour. The millionaire manufacturers in the United States debauch democratic institutions for their own ends. Trusts, rings, syndicates and combines all flourish under the shadow of protection, and exploit the general consumer by forcing up prices when they are once relieved from foreign competition.

REFERENCES :—

- Protection or Free Trade*, by Henry George (Kegan Paul, 1892).
Arguments on either side of the Fiscal Question, by Sidney Buxton (Murray, 1904).
The Case against Free Trade, by W. Cunningham (Murray, 1911).
The Case against Tariff Reform, by E. Enever Todd (Murray, 1911).
Facts for the Workers about Protection, Free Trade and Monopoly, by Philip Snowden (Cassell, 1904).
Elements of the Fiscal Problem (King, 1903) ; *A Fiscal Dictionary* (Methuen, 1910) ; and *The Future of Work* (Section xi., "Tariff Reform—ten years after"), by Leo Chiozza Money (Fisher Unwin, 1914).
Free Trade and Protection, by Henry Fawcett (Macmillan, 1881).
Progress and the Fiscal Problem, by Thomas Kirkup (Black, 1905).
The Servile State, by Hilaire Belloc (Foules, 1912).
The Problems of the Commonwealth : a symposium (Macmillan, 1916).
The Statesman's Year Book, current number, gives statistics.
The Return to Protection, by Prof. W. Smart (Macmillan, 1906).
The New Protectionism, by John A. Hobson (Fisher Unwin, 1916).
Modern Tariff History in Germany, U.S.A., and France, by Percy Ashley (Murray, 1910).
The Tariff Problem, by W. J. Ashley (King, 1911).
Free Trade, by Lord Avebury (Macmillan, 1908).
The Fiscal Debate made Easy, by W. H. Mallock (Eveleigh Nash, 1903).
The Nation as a Business Firm, by W. H. Mallock (Black, 1910).
British Industries under Free Trade, ed. by Harold Cox (Fisher Unwin, 1903).
Articles : "A Free Trader's Apology," by Leonard W. Reid (*Contemporary Review*, Oct. 1918). "Imperial Preference—and after?" by G. B. Grundy (*Nineteenth Century*, Dec. 1918).

COMMERCIAL RETALIATION

Introductory Note

By this name is understood the policy of imposing "retaliatory" duties on goods which we import from a foreign nation, so long as that nation refuses to give reciprocal or "fair" treatment to the goods which we export to it, or maintains a tariff or bounty system which unfairly penalizes Britain or her Colonies. The policy of retaliation is specially aimed at stopping the import of foreign goods which are sold here at prices below what they cost to produce.

Many of the arguments for, and against, this policy have been summarized already under "Protection."

The following may be added :—

FOR

1. Reciprocity is no more than fair play. Retaliation is not protection : it simply endeavours to force foreign nations to treat us as we already treat them. We cannot negotiate effectively for a reduction of tariffs unless we have something with which to bargain. Retaliation is the only weapon by means of which a protectionist system can be conquered, and a protectionist people brought to reason.

2. At present England is the one great open mart in the world, and so the one great "dumping-ground." Foreign trade combinations are not only sheltered by tariffs, but encouraged by subsidies, bounties, exemption from taxes,

and low freights ; thus they are able to manufacture goods in huge quantities which hold a monopoly of their own home market and so can be sold in England at or even below cost price.

3. It becomes hopeless for our manufactures to compete with goods produced under such conditions, and often by sweated labour, especially as our laws and our Trade Unions protect British workmen against sweating, insanitary conditions, etc. To place the British producer on a fair footing, we must retaliate by excluding the produce of sweated labour abroad.

4. This has grown more than ever imperative since the dangerous development of foreign syndicates and trusts, which deliberately operate to raise or lower prices and to dislocate the normal course of trade.

5. Retaliation would enable us to obtain fair commercial treaties from other nations, which now (in spite of their pledge to grant us "most favoured nation treatment") habitually place their heaviest duties on such goods as they import mainly from us, and their lightest duties on such goods as they import mainly from countries which practise retaliation.

6. While our commerce has nothing to fear from fair competition, it is being gradually destroyed by this unfair form of attack. The aim of "dumping" is to capture the British market by first ruining the British manufacturer. When once our British sugar refineries (for instance) had all been compelled to close through the "dumping" of foreign bounty-fed sugar, this sugar would promptly rise to a monopoly price.

7. Although some particular home industries may profit at present by the "dumping" of cheap raw material, this gain cannot be permanent, and it is far more than counter-balanced by the injury done to other trades.

8. On the other hand, if retaliation involved some temporary loss, such loss would be abundantly repaid by the fairer terms of competition which retaliation would speedily secure.

9. Retaliation is a weapon essential to defend our self-governing colonies from foreign attack in cases where they give a preference to goods from the mother country. The danger is by no means imaginary. Germany has already penalized Canadian imports for this very reason.

10. Probably no more would be necessary than for our Government to possess power to retaliate in cases of unfair treatment. As we do the largest trade and hold the strongest position, we need not be afraid of fiscal reprisals. For their own sakes the protectionist nations would quickly come to terms. England's threat to exclude bounty-fed sugar has already secured a general abolition of the bounties.

AGAINST

1. It is a cardinal fallacy to consider trade as a battle, and not as an exchange of benefits. We profit by obtaining goods, as well as by selling them; and we should penalize ourselves far more than any other people if England ceased to be the great open market for all countries.

2. The amount of actual "dumping" has been grossly exaggerated. From the nature of the case it can only be a temporary and partial thing, due to special circumstances like the sales of bankrupt stock at low prices. Producers will not go on permanently selling at a loss. Moreover the real harm dumping has done us is also exaggerated. Our iron trade, for instance, is said to have suffered particularly from this practice. Yet, according to the income-tax assessors, the total profits of the iron trade rose from £3,000,000 in 1898-9 to £5,380,000 in 1900-1.

3. To buy cheaply cannot be anything but an advantage to us. The consumer benefits by the low price he pays, and, as a rule, these artificially cheap goods are unfinished materials to be worked up by British manufacturers, who can thus employ more labour at home and compete better with their rivals abroad. If these "dumped" goods were shut out here, they would go to other markets and so increase the advantage of the foreign producer.

4. The real antidote to trusts and syndicates is to be found in the utmost amount of free competition, and not in any tariff system under which they invariably thrive.

5. Retaliation would not effect its avowed object. We see how between other nations instead of lowering duties it provokes further retaliation, until the tariff barriers on both sides become wellnigh prohibitive. To adopt it would involve England in a commercial conflict with the world in which she must necessarily lose more than her opponents.

6. Although we do not threaten retaliation when we negotiate commercial treaties, the practical result is that Portugal and Haiti are the only countries which withhold from us any fiscal exemption which they grant to others.

7. As a rule, we could only retaliate upon a protective country, by putting a duty on something which it sends us of a different kind from that home trade which we wish to defend. Thus the countries which levy the highest duties on our manufactures are Russia and the United States—the latter of which does us most harm by "dumping." Yet our imports of manufactures from these countries are comparatively so small, that we could only retaliate on them by taxing the food or the raw materials which they send us. For instance, the United States puts heavy duties on English woollen goods; but we could not put a counter-vailing duty on American woollen goods, since we import none. We should be driven to tax American corn or cotton,

and so dislocate the Lancashire cotton trade or raise the price of bread over the United Kingdom.

8. Retaliation is merely a disguise for protection. In the many industries where a retaliatory duty did not succeed, it would become permanent. All other trades would demand similar protection, and most of them could allege some amount of "unfair" treatment by the foreigner. No government could decide equitably which trades really needed such protection, and to what extent they deserved it. We should speedily come to protection all round.

9. To threaten retaliation is idle—and indeed dangerous—unless we are absolutely prepared to carry it out. It will have no effect, unless we convince a protective nation that we can and shall do its trade more harm than it can do our trade. But this power is precisely what we do not possess.

10. Our self-governing Colonies enjoy such entire fiscal independence that they "dump" goods here themselves and they must be treated as fiscal units. Moreover, in dealing with foreign nations they chiefly export food-stuffs and import manufactures, and thus they stand in a very different position from the mother country, if they desire to retaliate on their own account.

11. The British Government can always ask Parliament for special power to deal with any particular case of commercial "unfairness" on the part of a foreign nation. But no Government could be trusted with arbitrary authority to impose or relax duties as it thought fit.

REFERENCES:—

See under PROTECTION.

COLONIAL PREFERENCE

Introductory Note

This proposal is understood to mean that (i.) the British Colonies should levy lower duties on goods imported from Great Britain than on goods from other countries ; while (ii.) the Mother Country should admit all Colonial produce free, or at lower rates than those levied on competing foreign produce.

FOR

1. The dominant feature of the last two centuries has been the gradual expansion of England beyond the seas. The urgent need of to-day is to draw together the scattered parts of our Empire into effective unity. But Imperial Federation must be built upon commercial solidarity. In Mr. Chamberlain's words, " A system of preferential tariffs is the only system by which the Empire can be kept together."

2. The question concerns the future unity of our Empire and cannot be settled by the worn-out shibboleths of statesmen half a century dead, who never realized either the possibilities or the perils of to-day.

3. Our great self-governing Colonies, Canada, Australia and the Cape, which have already given signal proofs of their loyalty, are making us practical offers in this matter. If we refuse their advances, we shall drive them into a

spirit of antagonism. Canada, in particular, would probably be forced into commercial reciprocity with the United States.

4. It is not proposed to interfere with the political or fiscal freedom of the Colonies. The various parts of the Empire are invited to enter into a voluntary agreement which will benefit them all—separately and collectively. The great ideal of free trade within and throughout a self-sufficing Empire cannot be realized at present. But Colonial preference is the first step towards this ideal, with all its splendid prospects for the future.

5. Our trade with foreign countries is sensibly contracting, on account of their hostile tariffs ; while our trade with the Colonies is expanding rapidly. Already two-fifths of our home exports go to British possessions. In proportion to their population, our Colonies buy from us far more than foreign countries. Ought we not to cultivate trade with our kinsmen and fellow-subjects rather than with rival and hostile nations ?

6. Even if by adopting a system of Colonial preference our foreign trade were to suffer, this loss would be more than compensated by the increase in our Colonial trade, which has possibilities of indefinite expansion. With its vast and varied provinces the Empire may be made self-supporting and self-sufficing : it can produce every single necessity and nearly every luxury of life. Now preferential treatment of the Colonies would rapidly develop their enormous resources, stimulate emigration, and so create new demands for the manufactures of the Mother Country.

7. In 1897 Canada began to grant a rebate of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on the import duty on goods from the United Kingdom. British imports into Canada have risen from £6,000,000 in 1897 to over £10,000,000 in 1902.

8. Mr. Chamberlain has frankly admitted that "if we

are to give a preference to the Colonies, we must put a tax on food." But the chief part of such a tax would be paid by foreign producers and importers and would not fall on the British consumer. And, as Mr. Chamberlain has said again, "Even if the price of food is raised, the rate of wages will certainly be raised in greater proportions." Moreover the new import duties levied on corn and meat would be compensated by the existing duties to be remitted (under this scheme) on other articles of common consumption. Thus, "if a working man were called upon to pay 3*d.* a week additional on the cost of his bread, he might be relieved by a reduction of a similar amount on the cost of his tea, his sugar, or his tobacco."

9. Even if Colonial preference entailed for the present some apparent sacrifice, we ought to welcome it for the sake of consolidating and building up the Empire. Besides its other advantages, this policy would give an immense impetus to farming both at home and in the Colonies. Before many years it would deliver us from our dependence on foreign food supplies in time of war. And by reviving British agriculture, it would bring back population from our congested cities on to the land once more.

AGAINST

1. Every patriot would make sacrifices in order to unite the Colonies more closely to the Mother Country. But the strongest and safest bonds exist already, in our common blood and speech and history and traditions and laws. Out of these deep-rooted natural affinities our Empire has grown up, and shows no signs of falling asunder. Many years ago we abolished preferential trading with our Colonies, and the Empire has grown steadily stronger, wealthier, and more united. The same freedom will best promote its

still closer union. A wise mother does not bribe her children to remain by her side.

2. Colonial preference, so far from bringing about closer Imperial unity, would involve constant friction, jealousies, and ill-will. As soon as you tax food for the sake of the Colonies you make every British working man feel them as a burden and a hardship. The preference which they would give us does not touch their supplies of food or raw material; but the preference which we must give them affects the bread and meat of 40,000,000 people. Moreover the system entails a process of tariff-haggling between the Mother Country and each Colony in succession over a problem so complex that the wit of man could not devise a preferential scheme equitable and workable between all the parties concerned. The system would tend to disintegrate, rather than to consolidate the Empire.

3. Internal free trade throughout the Empire might benefit us, as it has undoubtedly proved most advantageous to the United States. But a system of discriminating duties, involving separate fiscal bargains with each Colony, would only raise new obstacles to hinder freedom of exchange. The United Kingdom, India, the Crown Colonies, and (to a large extent) South Africa are on a free trade basis already.

4. Out of our total external trade of £880,000,000 a year, only £225,000,000 goes to other parts of the Empire—nearly one-third of this being taken by India. Our export trade with the protectionist Colonies is only £60,000,000—and for this we are asked to disturb and dislocate our whole trade of £880,000,000. The Colonies contain a population of 11,000,000 people, and increase but slowly. Our pre-war exports to Germany, Holland and Belgium were twice as large as our exports to Canada and Australasia.

5. British prosperity depends far more on our home trade than on our foreign trade. If we tax the food of our entire home population, we diminish their power to purchase all other articles, and injure the whole internal trade of the country.

6. Colonial preference might provoke dangerous reprisals, particularly from the United States, who could, for instance, levy a ruinous export duty on cotton, or stop the transit of Canadian wheat for shipment from their ports. Moreover, if we impose a permanent food-tax for the sake of the Colonies, we rob ourselves of the possibility of an intermittent food-tax which is our chief weapon for Retaliation. These two cannot possibly be combined. (See the previous subject.)

7. The self-governing Colonies are strongly protectionist. Their great object is to foster their own industries. Every year proves that they have no intention whatever to admit British manufactures free. The preference already granted by Canada still leaves her manufacturers with a 24 per cent protection over British goods. This kind of preference does us very little good. And if food and raw materials were taxed at home, our home manufacturers would be still further crippled from competing in these Colonial markets.

8. Since the grant by Canada of a preference to British goods, our total exports to Canada have indeed grown, but the proportion they bear to the total Canadian imports has shrunk from 27.58 per cent. in 1897 to 24.95 per cent. in 1902. Mr. Chamberlain confessed in 1892 that "the substantial results have been altogether disappointing."

9. Three-quarters of our food supplies come from foreign countries. To tax these, so as to "stimulate agriculture at home and in the Colonies," must raise the price of our food by an amount far greater than the benefit which

the revenue or the Colonies would reap. The cost of living would seriously increase, while there is no proof whatever that wages or salaries, in most cases, would rise. In our social system, which has been evolved under free trade, the resultant hardships would fall most heavily on the struggling classes, millions of whom are now subsisting on a bare living wage. Tobacco, and even tea, cannot be counted as necessities like meat and bread.

10. Colonial preference must necessarily lead to duties not only on food, but on wool, hides, timber, etc., and before long to protection all round.

11. If we were involved in war it might become a serious national danger to have our food supplies drawn entirely from within the Empire. For example, the United States would not readily allow that food-stuffs were "contraband," so long as we were the largest customer for her wheat.

12. There is nothing to hinder the Colonies from giving preferences to British imports in their own markets, as some contribution toward the immense cost of maintaining and defending the Empire, which now falls almost entirely on the Mother Country.

REFERENCES :—

See under PROTECTION.

SHOULD A LIVING WAGE FOR ALL BE FIXED BY PARLIAMENT

YES

1. Wages should be sufficient to enable every labourer to live in a manner consistent with the dignity of a human being. Anything short of this is a great moral wrong and a serious danger to the State.

2. It is true that so-called economic laws are said to be against artificially regulating the rates of wages, but such laws in effect only state that certain results will follow from certain sets of circumstances. The conditions precedent to these results *can* be changed by human effort.

3. Belief in the power of economic laws to prevent any lasting modification in rates of wages by human action is cherished and kept alive by those who have a direct interest in keeping wages low.

4. The fallacy of blindly following the teachings of economists in these matters is shown by the disastrous results of the policy of *laissez-faire* in the growth of factory systems ; and the plea of impossibility is disposed of by the gain to industry as a whole, and not merely to labour from the more enlightened policy embodied in the factory acts, and such legislation.

5. The law of increasing returns is applicable to labour. The better labourers are paid the more efficient do they become, and therefore cheaper in the long run. Economists

recognize this, and so do the more enlightened of employers.

6. The strict economists who preached salvation by unlimited bargaining believed that this would produce a living wage. Since events have proved them in error, a modification of their doctrine is required.

7. The churches from earliest times have urged the justice of a living wage. Leo XIII wrote an encyclical in favour of the principle, and many Protestant divines have urged it upon mankind.

NO

1. The scheme, like so many others based upon vague theories of the "rights of man," is impracticable. In the question of wages we are concerned with economics and not with ethics. How is the figure to be arrived at? The cost of living varies continually from time to time and from place to place. A man's calling and the position he must keep up is another difficulty.

2. Men should be free to bargain as best they can in the case of human labour as in everything else, and only free bargaining can lead to just rates of wages being paid.

3. Interference with free bargaining is bad for the labourer as well as for the employer, for if profits are diminished the rate at which capital is saved is diminished, and with it the power of production. Consequently the national dividend is decreased and all suffer alike. Capital also will emigrate.

4. If wages are artificially forced up the price of the products of labour must rise, and since labour is the largest consumer labour is the heaviest loser.

5. Experience shows that a forced minimum wage is very apt to be the maximum. Hence the competent worker is penalized for the benefit of the incompetent. Also, though employers may be compelled to pay no less than the minimum, they cannot be compelled to employ, and old and infirm workers may be discharged.

6. Even if ethical arguments are admitted, the proper procedure is by moral suasion of unscrupulous employers by religious bodies, force of public opinion, etc., and not by act of parliament, which is far too inelastic for so delicate a subject.

REFERENCES :—

- The Living Wage*, by Philip Snowden (Hodder & Stoughton, 1912).
A Living Wage, by J. A. Ryan (Macmillan, 1906).
Sweated Industry and the Living Wage, by C. Black (Duckworth, 1907).
The Social Problem (Nisbet, 1901), and *Work and Wealth* (Macmillan, 1914), by John A. Hobson.
The Future of Work, by Leo Chiozza Money ; chaps. vii. and viii. (Fisher Unwin, 1914).
Towards Industrial Freedom, by Edward Carpenter ; last chapter (Allen & Unwin, 1917).
Work and Wages, by Thorold Rogers (Fisher Unwin).
The Servile State, by Hilaire Belloc (Foulis, 1912).
The Hope for Society : a symposium (Bell, 1919).
Towards Social Reform, by Canon and Mrs. Barnett (Fisher Unwin, 1909).
Problems of Modern Industry, and Industrial Democracy, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb (Longmans, 1902).

IS A SYSTEM OF MENTAL TRAINING WORTH WHILE ?

NO

1. Mental training itself is of course always worth while, but "systems" are usually not. Our educational system has been developed into a state of such practical efficiency that no one can pass through the curriculum without receiving all the mental training of which he or she is capable, special systems of mental training are therefore unnecessary.

2. Systems tempt people who want to make short cuts to culture. Real mental efficiency can only be reached by hard work. There is no royal road to learning.

3. Most of these systems aim at the special and exclusive development of memory. Prodigious feats of memory are of course possible with the aid of a carefully planned scheme of mnemonics, but is it worth while? We do not want to rival Datas even though he had all the dates of history at his finger ends.

4. We do not want to "Prussianize" the mind. Organization is a good thing in its place, but when it is carried to the length of systematizing the mind itself then the ordinary mortal cries, "Enough! I do not want to be arranged and tidied out of my very personality."

5. Modern life is far too strenuous to make a system of mental training worth while. A man's energies are so

fully absorbed in his business or vocation that it is practically impossible for him to undertake any special system of mental training in addition. Nearly every one works far too hard nowadays. What we want is to reduce this excessive labour if possible, and not to add to it. Our forefathers managed to get through life pretty well without these mental gymnastics, it is clear therefore that the effort is hardly worth while for us.

YES

1. Our present educational system is mainly a system of cramming. We proceed on the assumption that the brain is passive, that it should be made to contain as much information as possible. We pump knowledge into the youthful brain. We overfill it, distend it, distress it : then we harrass and punish it for not being able to hold any more. No wonder originality is crushed, while reaction and mental lethargy is too often the result of the painful process. We need a totally different system. Mental training must be substituted for mental stuffing. The mind is active, not passive. Its powers are not confined to assimilation, but range through observation, perception, reflection, deduction, decision, action, and confidence. All these powers, and many more, are just as susceptible to training as the muscles of the body. It is clear, then, that a well thought out system of mental training is one of the great needs of the day.

2. Most of the systems which have been advanced to meet this need may be put aside on the ground that they are merely mnemonic, that is they are memory-aid schemes which merely systematize cramming. The best known system which really attempts to develop the thinking powers scientifically is what is now briefly called "Pelmanism." Whether a system of this kind is "worth while"

depends on whether it is constructed on sound psychological principles, and on whether the results achieved are satisfactory.

3. No system is or can be perfect, but Pelmanism certainly is based on the best psychological thought of the day, applied in the light of vast experience in dealing daily with numerous and sharply contrasted individual cases, while its practical success is indisputable ; it follows then that this particular system is worth while.

4. All our knowledge comes to us originally through the senses. It is therefore an evident and reasonable course that a sound system of mental training should commence with exercises carefully calculated to increase the efficiency of these senses, especially of sight and hearing, on which we principally rely for our knowledge. In order to observe facts correctly and to remember them the attention must be trained, interest aroused, mind-wandering checked, and the powers of concentration developed ; hence it is logical that a thorough discipline of the senses should be followed by a systematic training and exercising of these all-important mental powers. This is entirely neglected in our present educational system. The necessity for accurate observation is indeed emphasized in all scientific education, but this is not enough. Unless there is some definite system or course of training, the expanding mind will not be able to make anything like a full use of its inherent powers. The mind, like the athlete, is trained not by over-feeding, but by exercise.

5. Even the best and most systematic training of these powers of the mind will be of little avail if we neglect the will, which is the driving force of personality. The will is just as responsive to proper training as is the power of observation, or attention, or interest, or concentration. Fear is nothing but a bad habit, as is shyness, lack of self-confi-

dence, and many other weaknesses which militate against success in life. A systematic discipline of the will can expel these habits. We *can* if we *will*. This great fact is totally lost sight of in our current educational methods. It is therefore high time that our educational authorities should adopt some definite system of mental training, such as Pelmanism, so that the rising generation may be effectively taught how to discover, develop and exercise all the wonderful powers and capacities of the mind to the highest pitch of excellence of which it may be individually capable. Education will then cease to be a useless accumulation of mental lumber, and will be transformed into a real and effective training for a useful and successful life.

REFERENCES :—

- Positive Philosophy*, by Auguste Comte.
Psychology (Bell, 1897), and *The Story of Thought and Feeling* (Newnes, 1900), by Fred Ryland.
Psychology (Home Univ. Library, 1912) and *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (Methuen, 1915), by Prof. William McDougall.
Talks to Teachers on Psychology, by Prof. W. James (Longmans, 1899).
Foundations of Character, by A. F. Shand (Macmillan, 1914).
Principles of Psychology, by Herbert Spencer (Williams & Norgate, 1890).
Psychology of Emotions, by Th. Tilot.
The English Utilitarians, by Leslie Stephen (Duckworth, 1900).
The Human Mind (1891), *Outlines of Psychology* (1892), *The Teacher's Handbook of Psychology* (1909), by Prof. J. Sully (Longmans).
The Art of Thinking, by T. S. Knowlson (Werner Laurie, 1918).
Thinking as a Science, by Henry Hazlitt (Dent, 1916).
The Psychology of Child Development, by Irving King (Fisher Unwin, 1906).
The Place of Psychology in the Training of the Teacher, by A. Darroch (Longmans, 1911).

FURTHER SUBJECTS FOR DEBATE

1. Should we establish national granaries ?
2. Is the art of letter-writing declining ?
3. Can the Church keep her hold on young men ?
4. Should canvassing at parliamentary elections be abolished ?
5. Would we choose to live our lives over again ?
6. Ought we to have a National Theatre and a Dramatic Academy ?
7. Do we want realism or impressionism in art ?
8. Should a starving person be convicted of theft for taking bread to save life ?
9. Is credit capital ?
10. In what does the prosperity of a nation consist ?
11. Is the theory of bimetallism sound ?
12. Ought the U.S.A. to take a permanent place in European politics ?
13. Can self-denial ever be immoral ?
14. Is there such a thing as a disinterested motive ?
15. Should there be any limit put to the results of war ?
16. Should the law against suicide be altered ?
17. Which is the better for a country—well-endowed professorships or richly revenue'd bishoprics ?
18. Ought horse-racing to be abolished ?
19. Ought the ticket-of-leave system to be abolished ?
20. Ought doctors to have the power to put patients

suffering from incurable diseases out of their misery ?

21. Under modern conditions is celibacy preferable to married life ?
22. Is true education a mental training or a preparation for special pursuits ?
23. Is vegetarianism a fad ?
24. Is suburban life duller than country life ?
25. Ought entertainments risking human life to be prohibited ?
26. Does modern education fail to develop character ?
27. Are hospital nurses degenerating ?
28. Is government wanted more or less as civilization advances ?
29. Ought we to restrict the export of coal ?
30. Has the invention of gunpowder been a curse ?
31. Do we learn more from reading or from observation ?
32. Is the principle of utility a safe moral guide ?
33. Should pulpits be thrown open to women ?
34. Are Eastern races happier than Western ?
35. Is lynch law ever justifiable ?
36. Can we abolish gambling ?
37. Are the clergy priests or pastors ?
38. Is there real moral value in the Confessional ?
39. Ought Churches to abolish pew-rents ?
40. Which should be supreme, the Bible, the Church, or the Conscience ?
41. Do the clergy hinder the progress of humanity as much as the army ?
42. Is every man the best judge of his own interests ?
43. Are women constitutionally Conservative ?
44. Is science the destroyer of poetry ?
45. Is duelling justifiable ?
46. Which is worse, the hypocrite or the liar ?

47. Is Great Britain on the decline ?
48. What is a gentleman ?
49. How can we best serve our country ?
50. Is persecution always wrong ?
51. Which does experience justify, the optimist or the pessimist ?
52. Does ill-health improve people's characters ?
53. Are Christians happier than other people ?
54. Which do us more good, our friends or our enemies ?
55. What is success in life ?
56. Ought the government of the country to be in the hands of lawyers ?
57. What is bad language ?
58. Which are the greater trial, poor relations or rich ?
59. Did Bacon write Shakespeare ?
60. Ought we to agitate for definite ethical training in schools ?
61. Is pleasure the end of moral conduct ?
62. Is an age of general intellectual culture favourable to the development of great men ?
63. Ought corporal punishment to be abolished in schools ?
64. Should the ringing of church bells be prohibited ?
65. Should we keep diaries ?
66. Should the Fire Brigade be a branch of the Army ?
67. Can the Sermon on the Mount be really carried out in modern Britain ?
68. Has a man any natural rights apart from the welfare of the race ?
69. Are museums a failure ?
70. Should all boys be taught a trade ?
71. Should amusements be taxed ?
72. Is the insular position of Great Britain an advantage under modern conditions ?

73. Ought we to nationalize Dr. Barnardo's homes?
74. Should the State supply free technical education?
75. Is our modern intellectual development due more to literature or to science?
- ✓ 76. Should the game of cricket be reformed?
- ✓ 77. Should there be a tax on bachelors?
78. Is the celibacy of the clergy desirable?
79. Is psychology becoming an exact science?
80. Can the middleman be eliminated?
81. Is there a Yellow Peril?
82. Are houses ever really haunted?
83. Does evolution conflict with ethics?
84. Is Disarmament possible?
85. Is Church-going any use?
86. Is Evangelicalism dying?
87. Ought punishment to be retributive or reformatory?
88. Is High Licence the solution of the drink problem?
89. Is family life doomed?
90. Must the world ultimately starve?
91. Have we anything to fear from our own militarism?
92. Are the Latin nations feminine in character?
93. Is death a curse or a boon?
94. Should Land Banks be established?
- ✓ 95. Is music being murdered by modern technical dexterity?
96. Are Scotchmen better soldiers than Englishmen?
97. Is hypocrisy one of our national characteristics?
98. Can England be saved from yellow-journalism?
99. Are Revivalists generally impostors?
100. Is our literature decadent?
101. Must we fight for new markets?
102. Is Ireland irreconcilable?
103. Is literature, economically, a form of productive labour?

- 104. Should the Second Chamber be strengthened?
- 105. Is the War Office hopeless?
- 106. Has Psychical Research become a branch of scientific research?
- 107. Is science killing literature?
- 108. "Town-planning."
- 109. Is chivalry dying out?
- 110. Does the Higher Criticism do more harm than good?
- 111. Does the worker know what he wants?
- 112. Ought a man always to obey his conscience?
- 113. Is travel the best education?
- 114. Is slavery really abolished?
- 115. Ought advertisements to be controlled, or totally prohibited?
- 116. What honours ought to be bestowed on the King's next birthday?
- 117. Are literary men decadents?
- 118. Is Mr. Bernard Shaw a danger to the State?
- 119. Ought England to exclude aliens?
- 120. Should the middle classes unite against the threatened tyranny of labour?
- 121. Should the Church be reformed?
- 122. Is the Co-operative Movement a failure?
- 123. Are we over legislated for?
- 124. Should the marriage laws be reformed?
- 125. The Housing Problem.
- 126. Should we have a ministry of Eugenics?
- 127. Plural Voting.
- 128. Should Mohammedans be allowed to rule over Christians?

139046





FEB 6 1978

**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET**

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
